



# ENGLAND:

*ITS PEOPLE, POLITY, AND PURSU.*

BY

T. H. S. ESCOTT.

VOLUME II.

---

*SECOND EDITION.*

---

CASSELL, PETTER, GALPIN & CO.

*LONDON, PARIS & NEW YORK.*

1880.

---

[ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.]





# CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
XVII. THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION . . . . .	1
XVIII. THE STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH SOCIETY . . . . .	22
XIX. SOCIETY AND POLITICS . . . . .	49
XX. CROWN AND CROWD . . . . .	69
XXI. OFFICIAL ENGLAND . . . . .	98
XXII. THE HOUSE OF COMMONS . . . . .	127
XXIII. THE HOUSE OF LORDS . . . . .	169
XXIV. THE LAW COURTS . . . . .	194
XXV. THE SERVICES . . . . .	228
XXVI. RELIGIOUS ENGLAND . . . . .	264
XXVII. MODERN PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT . . . . .	317
XXVIII. MODERN CULTURE AND LITERATURE . . . . .	356
XXIX. POPULAR AMUSEMENTS . . . . .	417
XXX. PROFESSIONAL ENGLAND . . . . .	450
XXXI. IMPERIAL ENGLAND AND CONCLUSION . . . . .	482



# ENGLAND.



## CHAPTER XVII.

### THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION.

The English Character gradually losing its Insularity—Why?—How English Accessibility to Foreign Influences exhibits itself—The Results of Closeness and Frequency of Communication between England and France, especially as manifested in English Domestic Life—The “Flat” System—Gallicised English Households—Some of the Results and Dangers to be expected from this Emancipation from National Prejudices—Modern Cynicism—Modern Cosmopolitanism—Change in Ideas and Practice of Domestic Life—The Old Country Gentleman and the New—Society *v.* Home—Parents and Children—Husbands and Wives—Marriage and Independence—Tendency to Free and Equal Intercourse of the Sexes: how favoured and illustrated by the Usages of Modern Life—The Fashionable Englishwoman’s Day—Change in the Bearing of Men towards Women.

THE English character is gradually losing the insularity that has long been the moral heritage of our geographical situation, and is divesting itself of the tastes, prejudices, and habits which have been regarded as inseparable from the race. The social relations established between England and France exist more or less intimately between England and other European countries. The summer vacations of the average Englishman are spent abroad—at French watering-places, which are not more expensive than

English, and which have a charm of novelty that English do not possess; in Brittany; in the Bavarian Tyrol; at the German spas; under the shadow of the Alps; by the shores, no longer solitary, of the Swiss lakes. Or the Anglo-Saxon holiday-maker goes farther afield, and, performing the grand tour on a scale worthy of the larger notions of these later days, puts a girdle round half the world, and embraces a hemisphere in his arduous pilgrimage of pleasure. He studies life under a republic in the United States, or he watches the working of the machinery of empire in India, or he endeavours to mark, by personal investigation, the differences between constitutional government as it exists in England, and constitutional government as it is transplanted to our Australasian dependencies. If he is unable to accomplish all this in a single expedition, he still frequently contrives to leave the well-worn Alpine tracks far behind, and sets his face in the direction of the Scythian steppes or the snowy crown of Ararat. Not a year passes in which adventurous Britons do not achieve feats hitherto unattempted, and the influence of these exploits is never lost. The names of such men as Macgregor, Burnaby, Bryce, Grove, Freshfield, become the watchword of the rising generation of Englishmen, and their exploits the standard of true British adventure.

It is, however, the intimacy between England and France whose effects are chiefly manifested upon the well-to-do classes of English society. Hitherto international political relations have been mainly confined to

diplomats and statesmen actually in office. It is a new experience to find gentlemen who sit below the gangway, or on the front bench on the Opposition side of the House of Commons, exchanging visits with M. Grévy and M. Gambetta. Nor is it only the increased space and attention given to French affairs in the English newspapers which cause a growing section of newspaper readers to take as much interest in the debates at Versailles as in those at Westminster, and to understand perhaps scarcely less about them. A practical experience of the conduct of parliamentary business in the Chamber of Deputies has ceased to be confined to a limited number of those whose business it is to lead and enlighten English public opinion in the press; and many a man who a few years ago would have had no other object in a trip to Paris than to eat dinners, visit theatres, or see the races at Chantilly, finds himself impelled to pick up what he can of French political knowledge by witnessing French political institutions actively at work.

The consequences of all this meet us in England at every turn. English theatrical managers go to French dramatists for their new pieces, just as Roman playwrights went to Greek. Our daily way of life is largely accommodated to French practice; our bills of fare are drawn up in the French language. In some instances our servants are French, Swiss, German, or Italian. The "flat" system, borrowed from France, has now existed on a considerable scale in London some fifteen years, and at the present time is in great and

growing favour. In the course of five years the rents of flats have doubled; Victoria Street, Westminster, is about equally divided into the offices of parliamentary lawyers, colonial agents, engineers, and into domestic dwellings. These last consist in every case of flats. The sum paid annually for a suite of eight rooms on the ground floor is not less than £250. The drawing-room floor commands a still larger sum; and unless the tenant chooses to ascend to the lofty level of the garrets, no set of apartments can be procured in this quarter of the town for less than £150. At Queen Anne's Gate there has sprung up a colossal block wherein resides an immense aggregate of families. Here attendance and cookery are forthcoming as well as house-room, with, of course, a proportionate charge for both. Dinners and other meals may be taken in the private apartments of the occupiers, or in the public saloon. The rents paid are fixed at figures which might be thought prohibitory, yet few sets of rooms ever remain long vacant. No arrangement can be imagined more diametrically antagonistic to the tastes with which Englishmen are generally credited. A flat, it may be said, is merely a house, with this difference, that the rooms are arranged, not on the perpendicular plan, but on the horizontal. It also possesses what may well seem a great advantage to busy men or women who are anxious to purchase the seclusion of domestic life at the cost of as little inconvenience as possible. The tenant of a flat is able to compound for all the various petty charges incidental to the householder by

payment of a lump sum. The flats belong to a company; the company has a secretary, and it is the business of that officer to see that the fabric of the apartments of each tenant is kept in proper order, and that no just complaint remains without attention. There are other advantages connected with the flat system of which the English paterfamilias is fully as conscious as the Continental. He can leave London at a moment's notice with his wife, children, and servants; or he can take his children and wife with him, sending the servants on a holiday, secure in the knowledge that his abode is hermetically sealed behind him; that there is danger neither from the street burglar nor from the charwoman—the traditional custodian of the London house when the family are out of town—and the strange relatives and unsavoury friends whom that person may invite into the drawing-room during the period of her occupancy.

For all this we are mainly indebted to the force of French example, and the new régime suggests the necessity of modifying the conventional conceptions of the English character. It is not an argument to drive too far; but one is induced to draw from it the inference that the ice of English reserve is gradually melting, and that the time may be coming when the English table d'hôte at hotels and elsewhere shall seem less artificially strange than, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, it does at present. As it is, we English are now in a transition state. We have adopted many of the outward observances of the country which is separated



from us by the Straits of Dover—French cookery, French wines, French art. We have still completely to assimilate some of the qualities of French manners. The attempt to reproduce the Continental household is not quite unknown in England. In some cases the effort is an affectation, in others it is made from a conviction that it is the most effective way of securing domestic comfort, with a certain amount of domestic elegance. English servants are not in good repute. They are often idle, exacting, thankless, incompetent, wasteful, and dishonest. There are a few English households in which not a single English servant is kept, and in which, except when company are entertained, not a single word of English is spoken. The children are taught to prattle French and German in advance of their native tongue. There are German and French nursemaids, the cook is Belgian, the parlourmaid Swiss, the footman Italian. You have no sooner entered the home managed upon such principles as these than you find English ways, habits, furniture, are left behind. The ornaments visible are French. The manner in which the furniture is arranged is French also. Eminently French, too, are the polished wooden floors, the fireplaces, and the decorations in the neighbourhood of the fireplace. It is the same at table—a good dinner, but not an English one. Such households as these are exceptional, but they exist, and they illustrate the tendency of the time.

Naturally there is a rather ridiculous side to this systematic acclimatisation of foreign modes. There

has been developed a type of character confined to no particular age and to neither sex, of which the chief feature is an adventitious aversion to everything distinctively English. Such people, having visited the Continent two or three years in succession, return possessed by a spirit of profound intolerance for the institutions and ways of their fatherland. They find the English theatres temples of dulness, the English press a scheme of organised platitudes. They prefer bad French cookery to sound English fare. They discover that the British breakfast is a barbarous and indigestible meal, and straightway they substitute the "déjeuner à la fourchette." They patronise French bootmakers and dressmakers. They profess a sudden ignorance of the good qualities of Great Britain. They boldly avow their inability to understand British prejudices. This is a social variety which has indeed become so common as scarcely to attract notice.

There are influences more important than those which the process of gradual and partial emancipation from English prejudice and habit has exercised upon the English character. Our stage, as has been said, is inundated with comedies and farces, of which the motive, the plot, and the moral are French alone. There is no doubt that many of our ideas of social propriety are as directly of Gallic origin as the dramas enacted behind the footlights. French literature, and foreign travel, familiarity with the more liberal views of Continental society—above all, the influences of the Second Empire—have caused us to regard many of our old-world

notions of right and wrong, the venial error or the unpardonable sin, as ridiculously narrow and obsoletely puritanical. Especially are these views, as well as their practical results, apparent in the relations which nowadays obtain between the sexes. The truth seems to be, that in this matter, as in others, we have shaken off the constraints which were once accepted in English society without question, or rebelled against with much peril, and have not yet learned by practice what are the corresponding or compensating constraints in foreign society. Further, this kind of cosmopolitanism engenders a more or less cynical disbelief in the reality and value of many old-fashioned virtues or institutions. We are still a nation of patriots; but what is the result which a systematic habit of depreciating the sentiments that lie at the root of patriotism must have upon a patriotic people? English patriotism, too, was always nurtured by the substance of local attachment. The love of country in the abstract has been resolvable into definite concrete constituents—the love of English institutions, of the principles of English liberty and justice, of the beauties in the English landscape, the richness of English woodlands, the varied tints of English hills and English plains; and not only the love of these, but the belief in them as objects worthy of admiration, and as objects to be found alone in our island home. This is a truth which English history, and which English literature—itsself the record and expression of English history—attest. But the homage which it implies,

and the devotion to which it points, are they not diminishing now? Is it a healthy sign that we should be passing, if we have not indeed passed already, from patriotic enthusiasm and self-exaltation to a mood of indifference and disparagement? English tourists and holiday-makers are apt to cultivate and to know all countries save their own. There is even a tendency among the English aristocracy to regard England as a country chiefly important because it supplies their rentals, furnishes them with good shooting, and the best hunting in the world.

The change that has taken place in the English view of life is not confined to a mere extension of the horizon of our daily experience, to a large toleration of the stranger and the alien, to new modes of thought, and to fresh topics of conversation. The domestic life of England has undergone a complete metamorphosis. For the nation is only an aggregate of households. Modern society is possessed by a nomadic spirit, which is the sure destroyer of all home ties. The English aristocracy pass their existence in a perpetual round of visits. They flit from mansion to mansion during the country-house season; they know no peace during the London season. They seldom endure the tranquillity of their own homes in the provinces for more than a month at a time, and then they temper their rural solitude by a succession of visitors from the great city. Existence for the fashionable and the wealthy is thus one unending whirl of excitement, admitting small opportunity for

the cultivation of the domestic affections, no time for reflection, or the formation of those virtues which depend upon occasional intervals of thought and seclusion.

Here and there in some secluded corner of the country may be found a survival from the old school of country squire, who is regarded with only an antiquarian interest by his descendants of to-day. He is not a great landlord; he is what, in the present age of immense fortunes, would be even regarded as a poor man; he has a rental of some four thousand a year, he has never speculated, and he is content if he can transmit this fortune, not largely augmented but not diminished, to his son. His whole being is absorbed in his acres, his farms, his tenants, and his dependants. He lives among his own people, and the thought has never occurred to him that he might spend half his time elsewhere. Thirty years ago he took his eldest boy to Eton, and on the occasion of that memorable event he accepted the hospitality of a friend and contemporary, a fellow of the royal foundation. But with this exception he has not once slept away from home in the course of those three decades. Well stricken in years he is still hale and vigorous; he can walk over several miles of his own ground in a day, and is fully equal to longer excursions on the back of his stout sure-footed cob. The life which he leads now is the life which he has always led, not that necessitated by the infirmity of years, but the result of circumstances and custom. When he

was twenty years younger he had as little wish to make protracted absences from home as he has now. He remained where his lot had placed him and his forefathers before him, and he was content. He is hospitable, and knows every family in the county. If you visit him you will meet none but country folk, unless it be the friends whom his sons have brought with them from London. The hospitality, meted out with generous hand, is there for all to enjoy. But with the exception just named, the company gathered to partake of it is the same as regards its general composition as that which congregated there a century ago. And the talk, too, is purely old-world talk. The young men, fresh from Pall Mall clubs, or Temple chambers, or regimental mess, may discuss some of the events and scandals of the hour, what is doing at the theatres, what will be the next political combination at Westminster, what the next elopement in May Fair. Such gossip as this only brings into stronger relief the themes which furnish the staple of the general talk; and as you sit and listen to the two sets of speakers by turns, you begin to realise that they are separated from each other by the gulf that divides two eras of our social history.

Compare now with this specimen of a bygone epoch the English squire *à la mode*, opulent commoner, baronet, or peer, whether he is or is not in the front rank of the territorial aristocracy. He has inherited a fine estate, possibly more estates than one, and he takes a pride in it or them. He has travelled much, been round the

world, and on his return to England he went into the army, just in the same way that a few years earlier he went to Eton or to Oxford. Or he may have lived among more stirring scenes. Instead of having passed ten years in the Guards, and been a great campaigner in London, he may have seen active service in India and in the Crimea. But he has, as he calls it, settled down now. He is a keen sportsman, and he is something of a scientific farmer. He breeds stock of all sorts, and he is an excellent judge of stock. He has indeed a passion for cattle, and has been known to give as much as £4,000 for a shorthorn. In a word, he has all the tastes and knowledge of a country gentleman, and that is what he calls himself. But the country house of which he is proprietor probably does not see him for more than two or three months out of the twelve, and never for more than two or three weeks at a time. There is always business, social, political, and financial, or some pleasure scheme as urgent as business, which requires his presence in London. He spends a week in November at the fine old place which he has inherited, and then the thought strikes him that he will take the train to the metropolis and see a theatre or two. London, it is true, is conventionally empty, but there are sure to be acquaintances at the club. During the London season he is, of course, in London more or less continuously. There is an occasional run across to Paris, and when the London season is over, there are Goodwood and Cowes, and a little Continental trip. Before settling in for the winter he

braces his system and invigorates his family by a fortnight at some English watering-place. This brings him to the first month of winter, and he beguiles the period of his duty as country gentleman by the reception of a series of guests from London. He does not, indeed, neglect the county society, in spite of his nomadic existence, looks closely after his affairs, and exercises a general and real supervision of everything. He is a good landlord and, when he is at home, a good neighbour. His peculiarity is a constant and insatiable desire for change. Change, that is, of scene, for of the same companions he never seems to weary. The truth is, that for those who live, as it is called, "in society," there is but one society all the world over, abroad or at home, in town or in country. A modern country house is practically the same as a London house transplanted to a park, girdled with trees and hills, and commanding extensive views of rich level meadows. The men and women are the same that met each other daily a few months since in Rotten Row, at the opera, at dinner-parties, receptions, public balls. It is conversation, for the most part, in which those who do not live the same life can feel small interest and take no part. It is not provincial chatter, but it is local and personal, the locality being London, and it is not readily comprehended by the provincial neighbours who happen to be present.

The influences of the time are not favourable to domesticity, and in our progress towards cosmopolitanism the taste for the family life which



was once supposed to be the special characteristic of England has to a great extent been lost. The claims of society have continually acquired precedence of the duties of home. The heart of the modern mother may in reality yearn with the same fondness as of old towards her offspring; she does not permit herself, or events do not permit her, the same opportunity of indulging it; she has her own position to assert in the great world; she has the ambition of her husband to remember and advance. Society has become the fetish before whom women prostrate themselves, and the mothers who used to live for their children have chosen to live for their acquaintances. This tendency and this resolve act—as they cannot help acting—as the solvent of household ties and domestic obligations. Neither father nor mother would allow that parental duties were neglected, but they might confess that they were vicariously discharged. They would urge apologetically the multiplicity of their social engagements, and the imperious necessity of attending to them. They would proceed to assure you that all which human care could do towards seeing that their children enjoyed every advantage had been done, that they inquired in the most searching manner as to the character of the nurses and governesses whom they engaged, and always impressed upon their sons the paramount necessity of keeping out of scrapes—“Do as I say; not as I do”—and making desirable acquaintances at school. All this may be true and

creditable enough, but it rests on the assumption that a parent can satisfactorily delegate to tutors or governors the sum of those duties which he owes to his child. The natural outcome of this is that the fashionable parents of the present day have little more than a mere superficial acquaintance with their own children. If this acquaintance is not cultivated early, it cannot be cultivated late. If the father or mother does not invite and train the confidence of their son or daughter when the quality of truthfulness, which with children is an instinct, has not been abused or blunted, it will not be won in after life; and if son or daughter make shipwreck of their future, the parental grief may be deep and the disappointment sincere, but a heavy responsibility will lie at the household door.

There are other points at which manifestations may be observed of the change which the domestic system of England is undergoing. The ultimate guarantee, the sole sure condition of domestic unity, is the identity of interest between husband and wife. Conjugal fidelity has not in times past been confined to this country, and the sanctity of the marriage tie has not been an exclusively English idea. It is, however, an idea on which a very remarkable degree of emphasis has been laid in England. It is impossible to deny that the relations between husband and wife show often an increasing laxity. Here, as in other things, we have qualified our native views by comparison and contact with French examples. The very phrases by which, in the French vernacular, marriages

of different sorts have long been spoken of, have become naturalised in the English language. The flirtations of girlhood are perpetuated or reproduced in what was once the staid and decorous epoch of matronhood. Nor is it merely that such things are; they are conventionally recognised as existing, and when recognition has been once won for a fact or a custom, it has practically obtained a social sanction.

Marriage is, as it will continue to be, the grand object in life to every young Englishwoman; it is only the theory of marriage which has been altered. The central idea, the very type of marriage with the English girl used to be—with tens of thousands of English girls is still—home. But in the higher strata of society girls marry in a large proportion of instances, not that they may become wives, mothers, mistresses of households, but mistresses of themselves, and are often goaded into it by a sense that a fashionable mother finds them inconveniently in the way. An establishment, horses and carriages, dresses and jewellery: these, of course, are aims which need no justification. What we are now chiefly concerned with is the accepted ideal of uxorial independence. The mere command of money is indeed a fascinatingly novel experience to most English girls, and it is probable that a more liberal supply of pocket-money than is given even to the daughters of wealthy parents, would do them no harm. As it is, girls in this position of life are apt to get into debt, and debt means the premature contraction of improvident and

extravagant habits. But many English girls have other tastes than the simple and perfectly legitimate pleasure which the anticipatory control of pocket-money gives. They are fond of paintings, of art, of playing the hostess, of admiration. It may be, if their temperament is of the severer kind, they are fond of politics, literature, or science. In any one of these cases the wife speedily creates for herself a little world of her own, in which the husband only figures as an occasional visitor.

Even when the spirit of feminine independence after marriage does not assume quite so emancipated a form as this, it very often asserts itself in a manner comparatively new to English society. The acceptance gained by the rite of five o'clock tea is the symbol of the ascendancy of the softer over the sterner sex. The incense of knightly worship easily blends itself with the fragrance which the delicate china cups exhale, and the world, touched at the sight, admits the propriety of the homage. The increased popularity of garden parties, water parties, and those *al fresco* banquets which retain their original name of pic-nics; of Hyde Park, as a lounge and a promenade; of such pastimes as lawn tennis and croquet—if indeed croquet anywhere survives; of Hurlingham, as an afternoon resort during the London season; of the Orleans Club, whether in its Twickenham or London house, as a meeting-ground for ladies and gentlemen, are all indications of the undoubted tendency to multiply as far as possible the opportunities of reunion, friendly or formal, between women and their actual or potential admirers.

The daily life of a modern English girl or matron—it makes little difference which, for the former will be duly chaperoned, and as to the latter, her husband has his own affairs to attend to—in the full swing of the London season, will show something of the extent to which we have cast off the old-fashioned restraints, and the perseverance with which we war against the shyness that has long been the Briton's reproach. There is the morning's ride in the Row from noon to two. All London is there; and it is a sight unique in the world. But, if you are a stranger, you should have a cicerone who is tolerably trustworthy and omniscient. The beauty and the splendour of the scene you can admire without such instruction. The trees, London trees though they are, are masses of well-grown greenery, and grateful indeed is the shade they afford under the July sun. The footpaths, which have the iron rails on the one hand, are lined with shrubs and flower-beds on the other. The rhododendrons have not yet lost their bloom. There is the scent of roses in the air; the perfume of mignonette; and now and again you catch the aromatic odour of the fir-trees lightly blown on the summer air. Hyde Park adds to its attractions as the most entertaining promenade in the world, all the charms with which successive landscape gardeners have been able to enrich it. There are not less than ten thousand men and women on the paths which fringe the ride, alternately gazing at the beauty of flowers and herbage, and the dazzling variety of the human panorama.

Every nation may say that it is represented. There are ambassadors from every civilised kingdom in existence, attachés taking their morning ride before the diplomatic toils of the day begin. India and Japan send their contingents to the equestrian array—Japanese who have come from a home already Anglicised to acquire the finishing touches of an English education, and Hindu youths who have defeated English undergraduates on their own ground. There are pretenders to foreign crowns, mounted on steeds as faulty as their own monarchical claims; and there are foreign merchants—Greeks, Armenians, Spaniards, Italians—careering on horses which are the most perfect specimens of their kind that money and breeding can procure. Many members of the two Houses of the English Parliament are there too, not a few men of business, more of pleasure, and more still who are both. There are ladies of every age, position, degree of beauty and virtue, rank, circumstance, and position in life—fair girls to whom the whole scene is a novelty, and one fraught with an excitement half painful, half bewildering; girls on whom it is beginning to pall, and who go through the whole thing mechanically; mere happy children scampering and exercising their ponies.

As our imaginary heroine enters the Row she is not alone, and before she has gone half a dozen paces she falls in with a phalanx of friends of both sexes. A walk gives place to a canter, and then a canter to a walk. And so with gossip and exercise the morning passes away, and the lady on whom we are in attendance

turns her horse's head towards home. There, in all probability, one or two early visitors have already come, and the chatter of Rotten Row is exchanged for the precisely similar chatter of the luncheon-table. Afterwards may come an hour's pause, unless indeed there is something to be done before five o'clock tea is served, and the hour for the evening's drive in the Ladies' Mile arrives. Very possibly, however, some engagement has been formed for the afternoon, and lunch is little more than well over ere the world again claims the presence of our ideal dame or demoiselle. It is perhaps one of the Saturdays on which the tournament of doves is held at Fulham, and a drive thither has been arranged on the box-seat of the coach of an amateur but eminent whip. Two ladies and three or four gentlemen are the complement of passengers, and Hurlingham is their destination—a spacious enclosure fenced round by trees, with tents, pavilions, and a semi-circular ring of spectators. There are the traps from which presently the blue rocks, strong of wing and hard to kill, will be let loose. There are the noble sportsmen, and there beyond is the knot of betting men engaged in making their book, and laying the noble sportsmen odds on the birds. In a few minutes business will commence, and you will hear nothing but alternately, or simultaneously, the inarticulate murmurs of polite talk, the successive cracks of the guns, and anon the hoarse roars of the gentlemen of the betting ring.

Theoretically this advance which we have made in the direction of a system of social intercourse between

the two sexes, conducted, as nearly as may be, on terms of complete equality, may be considered an improvement. But the equality is not yet entirely established; the process is not without certain hitches and awkwardnesses, and some of the evils of a state of transition have to disappear. The liberty is still a little new, and it may be that the deep draughts of it which are taken are a trifle too powerful for our as yet unseasoned social system. Intoxicated with a sense of their recently acquired privileges, the emancipated victims of outward restraints may be led to extravagances and extremes which they should be careful to avoid when they know better what it is not to wear the yoke. If social scandals are more common now than was once the case, it must be attributed, charitably, not to the new system, but to the fact that the system is new. When the novelty is worn away so will be the peril, and young men and maidens, recovering the conventional balance, will exhibit only the fair side of the social revolution.



## CHAPTER XVIII.

### THE STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH SOCIETY.

Three Elements in English Society—Fusion between the Aristocracies of Birth and Wealth—Results of the Process—Patricians in Trade—Gratification of Democratic Instinct, and Maintenance of Aristocratic Principle—The State of Things thus brought about favourable to Plutocracy—Absence of a *Noblesse* in England—Results of this Absence contrasted with Consequences of its Presence in Austria, &c.—Table of English Precedence, and the Principles on which it is arranged—Gradations in English Society—New Social Era in England dates from Reform Bill of 1832—The Decline of Dandyism—Essentially Solid and Serious Character of the Foundation on which English Society rests—How this Fact affects the English Estimate of different Professions and Callings—Social Position of Merchants, Stock-brokers, Lawyers, Authors, Artists, Doctors—Importance of State Recognition and Reward of Professional Men.

IN the constitution of English society at the present day, the three rival elements—the aristocratic, the democratic, and the plutocratic—are closely blended. The aristocratic principle is still paramount, forms the foundation of our social structure, and has been strengthened and extended in its operation by the plutocratic, while the democratic instinct of the race has all the opportunities of assertion and gratification which it can find in a career conditionally open to talents.

The antagonism between the aristocracy of wealth and birth has long been disappearing. The son of the newly-enriched father is identified in education, social training, habits, prejudices, feelings, with the scions of the houses of Norman descent. At all times there has been a tendency on the part of birth to ally

itself with wealth, and it would be found upon examination, that for the greater part of their princely rentals many a noble English stock is indebted to purely commercial sources. Judicious matrimonial alliances have largely assisted in identifying the two principles of wealth and birth. This has continued down to the present day, and the consequence is that though English society may be divided into the higher classes, the middle classes, the lower middle, and that vast multitude, which for the sake of convenience may be described as the proletariat, the feud between the aristocracy of lineage and of revenue is almost at an end. There are typical country gentlemen in the House of Commons and in society, but the country interest is no longer the sworn enemy of the urban interest. Our territorial nobles, our squires, our rural landlords great and small, have become commercial potentates; our merchant-princes have become country gentlemen. The possession of land is the guarantee of respectability, and the love of respectability and land is inveterate in our race.

The great merchant or banker of to-day is an English gentleman of a finished type. He is possibly a peer, and an active partner in a great City firm; if he is not a peer, the chances are that he is a member of the House of Commons. He is a man of extensive culture, an authority upon paintings, or china, or black-letter books; upon some branch of natural science; upon the politics of Europe; upon the affairs of the world. Does he then neglect his business? By no means. He has,

indeed, trustworthy servants and deputies; but he consults personally with his partners, gentlemen in culture and taste scarcely inferior, it may be, to himself; he goes into the City as punctually as his junior clerks; and when he returns from the City he drops for a few minutes into the most exclusive of West-end clubs. His grandfather would have lived with his family above the counting-house, and regarded a trip to Hyde Park as a summer day's journey. As for the descendant, his town-house is in Belgravia or Mayfair, he occupies it for little more than six months out of the twelve, and during the rest of the year lives at his palace in the country, takes a keen interest in the breeding of stock, the cultivation of soil, and the general improvement of property. There is, in fact, but one standard of "social position" in England, and it is that which is formed by a blending of the plutocratic and aristocratic elements. If it is realised imperfectly in one generation, it will be approximated to more closely in the next, and thus it will go on till the ideal is reached.

There is a rush just now equally on the part of patrician and plebeian parents to get their sons into business, and noblemen with illustrious titles and boasting the most ancient descent eagerly embrace any good opening in the City which may present itself for their sons. It is perhaps the younger son of an earl or a duke who sees you when you call on your broker to transact business; it may be the heir to a peerage himself who is head partner in the firm which supplies the middle-class household with tea, puts a

ring-fence round the park of the Yorkshire squire, or erects a trim conservatory in one of the villa-gardens of suburban Surrey. It may also be remarked that an institution which is the great object of menace and attack on the part of the radical reformers of the age has greatly assisted to knit together the various parts, sections, and interests of the social system, and at the same time that it has dispersed the aristocratic leaven has proved to be a distinctly popularising agency. Primogeniture, the bulwark of an hereditary nobility, is one of the guarantees of the alliance between the upper and the middle classes which has contributed to give us the social stability that other nations have lacked. Imagine primogeniture abolished, and the French system, as a possible alternative to primogeniture, adopted, an equal division of property between the various members of the family. The distinction between elder and younger sons would disappear. Most of the sons of our great landlords would have a competence, and as a probable consequence they would combine together to form an anti-popular and exclusive caste, would intermarry to a much greater extent than at present, would cease to go forth, since the necessity would cease, into the world to make their fortunes, and would erect a hard and fast line of demarcation between classes.

If we look at polite society in England as an entire system, we shall find that it differs in one very important respect from society in certain other countries and capitals of Europe. It has a nobility, but it has

not a *noblesse*. There is no titular distinction between the son of the younger son of the greatest duke in the land and the son of the commoner who has made a fortune in commerce. On the one hand, this absence of the perpetuation of nobiliary titles of courtesy from generation to generation divests English society of much of the exclusiveness of society on the Continent; on the other, it exacts for these titles, while they are in existence, the most rigid and jealous respect. Personal precedence has been abolished in our Indian dominions, and official precedence prevails in its stead. Official precedence is the order of the day in France and Italy. In Russia there is a strict system of military and bureaucratic precedence; in Austria the system is partly military and partly personal. In England the principle on which gradations of precedence are arranged is personal, though in practice a few exceptions to the rule may be found. The homage paid by society in England to the aristocratic principle is as genuine in spirit, though not so severe in form, as it once was in Austria — formerly *par excellence* the aristocratic country of Europe. Here, within the limits of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, there existed and still exists a great hereditary *noblesse*, the titles of prince, count, and baron being handed down in perpetuity from father to both sons and daughters. Society, in the approved sense of the term, was thus a close corporation, absolutely unapproachable by those who lacked in their cradle the necessary credentials of rank. Neither ability, nor wealth, nor great power

and influence in the State was accepted as an adequate title for promotion to the highest level. Within these sacred limits official rank of course existed; but it was never permitted to override roughshod the distinction of the purely nobiliary régime. So far has this principle been carried, that until lately it was a recognised thing in Austria that even the Prime Minister, unless of sufficient rank by birth, was not to be admitted to certain select ceremonies of state. The Princess Esterhazy, daughter of Lady Jersey, was excluded from several privileges for no other reason than that her great-grandfather was Mr. Child, the eminent banker. The principle which dictated this exclusion, though not extinct, is only partially operative at the present day, and if a lady of high rank, the wife of a man who occupies the most distinguished position, happens by the unequal marriage of one of her ancestors to miss the proper number of quarterings, she may be admitted to court, that is, into the society of the great world, even without special grace of the Emperor.

In English society, on the other hand, the chief fundamental fact is the absence of a *noblesse*—a fact which has its disadvantages as well as advantages, and which probably exercises a more marked influence upon our national character than has yet been noticed. The highest society in Austria is perhaps even now more agreeable to aristocratic Austrians than the society which most nearly corresponds to it in England to the aristocratic English. It is, in fact, a species of family party upon an extended scale—a magnified

edition of the exclusive patrician cliques and coteries, most of whose members are bound together by the tie not only of acquaintance and community of tastes and sympathies, but by kinship more or less remote. There is in consequence just that absence of constraint and reserve in the great social world of Austria which might be expected when the possibility of meeting any "doubtful person" was out of the question. In England, where the antecedents of many of those who mingle in the best society are obscure, and where the connections between titled and untitled families have infinite and invisible ramifications, it is natural, and it is right, that considerable caution should be used. Hence, in a great measure, the proverbial reserve of Englishmen. As it is impossible to tell from the mere fact of nomenclature whether any given individual is or is not the relative of a peer, so there is a tendency on the part of the many aspirants for social position not, perhaps, to affect such relationship, but certainly to affect an intimacy with highly placed personages. Comparative strangers addressing each other can never feel completely sure of their ground, and are apt to be agitated by misgivings as to their respective positions. The prosperous merchant into whose family the heir to a dukedom marries, will probably have near relations who belong to the lower order of the *bourgeoisie*. These social contrasts and strange juxtapositions are impossible in such a country as Austria, where, outside the limits of society—using the word in its most exclusive sense—there is scarcely

any distinction between the *bourgeois* and his servant; just as in England, inside society there is practically no distinction between the men who the day before yesterday were plebeians, and the patrician peer who boasts the blue riband of genealogy—a clearly ascertained line of ancestors who took part in the first crusades. In England, the wife of a great statesman takes her rank from her husband—*Ubi Clodius, ibi Clodia*. Where he goes, there she is invited. In Austria, the wife of the distinguished statesman or warrior who lacked the natal qualifications would scarcely feel aggrieved by receiving no invitation to enter the social paradise of the elect, and if admitted to it would experience the discomfort that comes from novelty and strangeness.

An examination of the principles embodied in the scheme of precedence by which English society is rigidly regulated will show two things—first, that though to the uninitiated it may seem “a mighty maze,” yet it is not on that account without a very distinct plan; secondly, that it abounds in compensations to that aristocratic principle, and to the representatives of that titular *noblesse*, whose claims to recognition English society, in comparison with Austrian, may be thought to ignore. “Precedence,” it is written in the book of Dod, “is not regulated by mere conventional arrangements; it is no fluctuating practice of fashionable life, the result of voluntary compacts in society; but, on the contrary, is part and parcel of the law of England.” Without going into historical and legal



details, it may be said that the table of precedence which is sometimes spoken of as a jumble of incomprehensibilities—a chaos of social conundrums, to be answered by capricious solutions, proceeds upon a distinct theory, and that it is perfectly logical in all its enactments. Its theory is an aristocratic theory—that of personal rank ; its logic is shown in the consistent application of the aristocratic principle.

The representative of the principle of an hereditary monarchy, the Sovereign and the members of the Royal Family, represent the apex of our social as of our political constitution. The Archbishop of Canterbury follows next. After the Primate of all England comes the Lord Chancellor, as keeper of the Queen's conscience, and then the Archbishop of York. The position which the Lord Chancellor occupies, midway between the two Primates, is a compromise effected subsequently to the time when the Chancellor first ceased to be a cleric. Next in the scale of dignity are some half-dozen eminent personages, all of them holding, it is true, high offices of state, but all of them also eligible in the first place to their offices in virtue of their wealth and personal rank. Thus the Lord High Treasurer, when there is any peer sufficiently illustrious for the post, succeeds the Archbishops ; but, to quote again from Dod, "the modern practice is to appoint certain commissioners for the performance of the duties of this office, who are usually called 'Lords of the Treasury,' but *who have no special rank in right of their offices.*" Similarly, the Lord President of the Council, the Lord Privy

Seal, the Lord Great Chamberlain, the Lord High Constable, the Earl Marshal, the Lord Steward of the Household, the Lord Chamberlain of the Household, take precedence of the dukes of England, provided they are in each case dukes themselves, in virtue of their offices. If they are not dukes, then they only take their place at the head of their brother peers of the same degree. With the exception of the Lord Chancellor and the Archbishops, who are the heads of the learned professions, and who are closely identified with the most essential of the spiritual and temporal functions of the Sovereign, the table of English precedence is one of purely personal precedence throughout; in other words, office only intensifies rank, and in a variety of instances rank is the indispensable qualification of office.

The dukes are followed by the eldest sons of the dukes royal, and we then come to the stratum of the marquissate. Here again there is the same consideration given to official when combined with personal rank. If the Lord Great Chamberlain, the Earl Marshal, the Lord Steward, the Lord Chamberlain, fail to be dukes, and are marquises, then, and only then, they have their place at the head of the marquises; but it should be observed that in some cases, as in that of the Earl Marshal, the offices are hereditary. After the marquises, we have dukes' eldest sons, then the earls, then the eldest sons of marquises, then the younger sons of dukes. Then come viscounts, followed by the eldest sons of earls and the younger sons of

marquises ; then bishops and barons. If a baron happens to be a Secretary of State, he is exalted over the rest of his order ; but a Secretaryship of State does not entitle the holder of any superior rank to any kind of precedence.

When one descends to the level regions of the commonalty, there is comparatively little that calls for notice. The Speaker of the House of Commons is the first "commoner" in England. Secretaries of State take precedence of the eldest sons of viscounts, the younger sons of earls, the eldest sons of barons ; and this constitutes one of the very few exceptions to the principle of personal dignity. Privy Councillors—the Chancellor of the Exchequer among them—the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, the Lord Chief Justice of England, the Master of the Rolls, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the Lord Chief Baron, and all other judges, have a place assigned to them before baronets, as also, on the other hand, have the younger sons of viscounts and the younger sons of barons. Then follow the multitude of knights innumerable, while professional men of all branches bring up the rear. Among the representatives of the faculties, clergymen have the first place ; and the great social grievance of the army in England is that its most distinguished members, unless they possess a title, or have been decorated with a high order, are without any definite position. Exceptions to these social rules there of course are, but they are only possible if the members of the company in which they are made are willing that they should be

instituted ; and at an ordinary London dinner-table the adherence to them is very rigid indeed. Sometimes they conflict in a rather ludicrous manner, and the case is not inconceivable in which, if each of three individuals insisted on his legal precedence, it would be doubtful whether any one of them could ever leave the room. Imagine that the Speaker of the House of Commons, a baron, and the son of a duke or marquis were placed in the same apartment, and were requested to leave it in the order of dignity. The Speaker, in point of rank, is before all commoners, and legally the son of a duke or marquis is only a commoner ; but the baron is before the Speaker, and the ducal scion before the baron. The social conundrum which thus presents itself may safely be left to rare experience to decide.

There is a story of a certain Duke of Norfolk, who was anxious to give a great entertainment to all his kinsfolk. It was found that his blood relations comprised upwards of 500 persons of both sexes, of whom one was earning a livelihood as keeper of a toll-bar on a turnpike road. It is needless to say that the idea of the family reunion was abandoned, because its complete execution was manifestly impracticable. This is one of the illustrations of what is always possible in a country where, as in England, a *noblesse* does not exist. It is, however, certain that if the humblest of the ducal kinsfolk had abandoned his lowly vocation, and had suddenly risen to distinction, he might have found his way into much the same society as that affected by the head of his house, and

he would have done so not because he was remotely connected with a duke, but because he had established a title to consideration. ,

Subject to certain conditions, the *parvenu* in England may associate with peers, even though he feels some constraint in their presence, while the son of the *parvenu* would be the equal of peers—nay, very possibly be a peer himself. This free development of social promotion is responsible for a large amount of petty social jealousy. Mr. and Mrs. A. are a couple whose place by birth is a respectable one in the great middle class. But they have gradually risen superior to it, and without legal rank have acquired a valuable prescriptive rank in what is called “society” *par excellence*. The husband has inherited a fortune, or has made his mark in politics, or has possibly distinguished himself in some other way: the wife is a perfectly bred lady, conspicuous by her accomplishments and tact. They are, therefore, made welcome in the most select drawing-rooms, and have a visiting list with which a duchess might be satisfied. But there is no rose without its thorn, and the social triumphs of this agreeable pair have aroused the envy of not a few households which in point of birth and worldly circumstance are fully their equals. The A.’s decline the invitations which they receive from these worthy persons, and the worthy persons accordingly declare that the A.’s are offensively elated by their promotion. On the other hand, the A.’s have a considerable amount of reason on their side; they are under no kind of antecedent

obligation to visit houses which are unacceptable to them, they have really gained a degree of consideration in more distinguished quarters, with which there is no harm in their being, and with which it would be strange if they were not, gratified. This fact is not understood in the region which lies outside their world, and if they were to enter that region they would find themselves in a thoroughly false and therefore more or less disagreeable position.

The era of the enlargement of English society dates from the Reform Bill of 1832, and if it has brought with it some contradictions, anomalies, and inconveniences, it has also been instrumental in the accomplishment of great and undoubted good. It has substituted, in a very large degree, the prestige of achievement for the prestige of position. The mere men of fashion, the fops, dandies, and exquisites, the glory of whose life was indolence, and who looked upon anything in the way of occupation as a disgrace, have gone out of date never to return. Both Brummell and D'Orsay, the latter especially, concealed sterling qualities beneath the polished affectation of their exterior, but the kind of fame which each of these acquired in his epoch would be an anachronism and impossibility now. Before the eventful year 1832, there existed a society in England very like the old exclusive society of Vienna. The chief and indeed almost only road to it lay through politics, and politics were for the most part a rigidly aristocratic profession. Occasionally men of the people made their way out of the crowd, and became personages

in and out of the House of Commons; but most of the places under Government were in the hands of the great families, as also were the close boroughs, and the tendency was to fill each from among the young men of birth and fashion. The Reform Bill admitted an entirely new element into political life, and threw open the whole of the political area. A host of applicants for parliamentary position at once came forward, and as a consequence the social citadel was carried by persons who had nothing to do with the purely aristocratic section which had hitherto been paramount. The patrician occupants of the captured stronghold, if they were somewhat taken aback by the blow which had been dealt them, accepted the situation and decided upon their future tactics with equal wisdom and promptitude. If the new-comers were to be successfully competed with, they saw that they must compete with them on the new ground, and must assert their power as the scions of no *fainéant* aristocracy. The impulse given to the whole mass of the patriciate was immense, and the sum of the new-born or newly-displayed energies as surprising as it was satisfactory. The man of pleasure ceased to be the type to which it was expected, as a matter of course, that all those born in the purple should conform.

The activity thus communicated directed itself into an infinite number of channels, and it has continued operative ever since. Our aristocrats of to-day are at least fired by a robust ambition. Many of them take up statesmanship as the business of their lives,

and work at its routine duties as if it were necessary to the support of existence. Those whose tastes do not incline them in the direction of the senate, write books, paint pictures, or carve statues. Perhaps, even probably, they are of a theatrical turn, and subsidise a theatre, or even manage a company. They go into business, or they dedicate their existence to agricultural enterprise. At least they do something. Society, in fact, has bidden adieu to its ideal of gilded and inglorious ease, and in strict conformity with the spirit of its new departure, selects its *protégés* and favourites upon a new principle. The question asked about any new aspirant to its freedom is not only, who is he? or how much has he a year? but, in addition, what has he done? and what can he do? The heroes and lions of society are not handsome young men, who can do nothing more than dress well, or dance well. They are seldom even those whose fame is limited to the hunting-field or the battue. They are men who have striven to solve the secret of the ice-bound pole, who have tramped right across the arid sands of a strange continent, who have scaled heights previously deemed inaccessible, who have written clever books, painted great pictures, done great deeds, in one shape or other. It is surely a considerable social advance to have substituted for the exquisites of a bygone period, as ideals of life for the rising generation, men who have followed in the track of Xenophon, or who have been the pioneers of civilisation on a continent.



Thus it may be fairly inferred that whatever its levities and frivolities, the foundation on which English society rests is essentially serious, the result of the traditional and pre-eminently English habit of taking grave and earnest views of life. Religion is not now spoken of; what is meant is, that pure enjoyment is not the idea of the typical Englishman in whatever class. He takes his pleasures heartily indeed, and with gusto, if he finds them in his path. Occasionally he may make the mistake of forsaking the true path of his career and following the phantom of pleasure till it lands him in disaster. These are our failures. The ordinary Englishman has ambitions, social and professional, and he subordinates all other things to them. He is bent upon improving his position, or immortalising his name. His dominant motive is the desire to rise, or the resolution to do to the utmost his duty in the sphere of life in which his lot has been cast. The plan of existence, thus regarded as the great and only opportunity for the accomplishment of a definite work, acquires an energising solemnity. The Englishman may stumble sometimes, but after the fall he picks himself up and pushes on to the goal.

A hundred illustrations might be given of the development of this inborn national tendency in the march of an English generation from the cradle to the grave. At school the boy who does nothing has neither popularity nor respect. He is without any recognised status in the little world which is the microcosm of the great world to which he will be

presently introduced. He may shine at his studies; he may excel in the cricket-ground or on the river. The one essential condition is, he must do something if he wishes to have any rank or consideration among his equals and contemporaries. This destiny pursues him throughout. At college the mere loafer is a nonentity; the reading man or the athlete is a personage. In the army no young officer ever yet made a reputation which one of his compeers envied by elegant dawdling. He has devoted himself to professional studies, and secured a place in the ranks of coming men. Or he has been of a less studious turn, and knows more of the stud-book and the racing calendar than of Jomini or Hamley. But he has established his reputation in the hunting-field or on the steeple-chase course, and he has extended or maintained the reputation of his regiment. It is the same whatever the pastime that he has made the business of his life; his character will be assessed by the degree of earnestness and success with which he has taken it up.

The degrees of esteem allotted to the different English professions are exactly what might be expected in a society organised upon such a basis and conscious of such aims. Roughly it may be said professions in England are valued according to their stability, their remunerativeness, their influence, and their recognition by the State. These conditions may partially explain the difference which English society draws between the callings of the merchant and the stock-broker. Stock-

brokers make immense fortunes; but there attaches to them a suspicion of precariousness infinitely in excess of that which, in some degree or other, necessarily attaches to all fortunes accumulated in commerce or trade. The merchant represents an interest which is almost deserving of a place among the estates of the realm, and with the development of which the prosperity and prestige of England are bound up. His house of business is practically a public institution, and the speculative element—the fluctuation of prices and the uncertainty of markets—enters as little as possible into it. Merchants have from time immemorial been the friends and supporters of monarchs—have taken their place in the popular chamber of the legislature, have been elevated to distinguished stations among the titular aristocracy of the land. We have had not only our merchant-princes, but our merchant-peers and merchant-statesmen. The calling has been recognised in our social hierarchy for centuries, and if not exactly a liberal, is an eminently respectable and dignified profession. Nor is the merchant, as a rule, so much absorbed in the affairs of his own business as to be unable to devote as much time as is necessary to the pursuits of society and the affairs of the country. His operations run in a comparatively equal and tranquil channel, and to hint that he lives in an atmosphere of feverish excitement is equivalent to insinuating a doubt of his solvency. It is different with the stock-broker, whose social position is so sudden that it cannot yet be looked upon as assured—whose wealth, though

great, has the garish hue of luck, and the glories associated with which may dissolve themselves at any moment into thin air, like Aladdin's palace, and who himself is popularly supposed to be more or less on the tenterhooks of expectation and anxiety from morning to night. The merchant drives to his place of business in a family brougham or barouche; the stock-broker drives to the station, where he takes the morning express to the City, in a smart dog-cart, with a high-stepping horse between the shafts, and a very knowing-looking groom at his side.

Such, at least, is the conception formed by the public of the two men of business, and it indicates not incorrectly the corresponding view of English society. The British merchant, as has been said, is very probably a member of Parliament; the instances in which stock-brokers are members of Parliament at the present day might be counted as something less than the fingers of one hand. The life of the ideal stock-broker is one of display; that of the ideal merchant, one of dignified grandeur or opulent comfort. Possessed of a certain amount of education, often acquired at a public school, sometimes both at Eton and Oxford, the stock-broker of the period has decided social aspirations. He makes his money easily, and he spends it lightly in procuring all the luxuries of existence. He marries a handsome wife, sets up a showy establishment, lays in a stock of choice wines, hires a French cook; he has carriages and horses, a box at the opera, stalls at theatres and concerts

innumerable. He belongs to one or two good though not always first-rate clubs. He has acquaintances in the highest circles, and congratulates himself on being in society. But the blissful experience is not one in which his wife shares. She has to be content with all the talk, stories, and scandal of society which she hears retailed at her husband's table by the young guardsmen and other patrician guests who readily accept the invitations to a house where cook and cellar are both excellent, where the hostess and such other ladies as may be present are pretty or attractive. As a consequence of this, there is a copious stream of male visitors at the residence of the fortunate speculator in scrip and shares, while the lord and master of the household is occupied in the City. Perhaps an uncharitable world begins to talk; at any rate, the glitter and show of the *ménage* acquire a certain flavour of Bohemianism, between which and the animating spirit of English society the only sympathy that exists is of a purely superficial kind.

Let us continue to apply the test which has been indicated to other departments of English professional life. We live in an age whose boast it is that it can appreciate merit or capacity of any kind. Artists and actors, poets and painters, are the much-courted guests of the wealthiest and the noblest in the land—to be met with at their dinner-tables, in their reception-rooms, and in their counting-houses. To all appearance, the fusion between the aristocracy of birth, wealth, and intellect is complete, and the representa-

tives of each appear to meet on a footing of the most perfect and absolute equality. Still the notion prevails that the admission, let us say, of the painter into society is an act of condescension on society's part, none the less real because the condescension is ostentatiously concealed. Nor does the fact that artists occasionally not only amass large fortunes, but contract illustrious matrimonial alliances, militate against the view. It is only possible where an entire class is concerned to speak generally, and to this, as to every other rule, there are exceptions. Why should the rule—always assuming that it is a rule—exist, and what are the explanations of it? As regards painters, there is this to be borne in mind: their calling is a noble one; but in view of the genius of English society, it labours under certain disadvantages. A vague and unreasoning prejudice still exists against the profession of the artist. The keen-scented, eminently decorous British public perceives a certain aroma of social and moral laxity in the atmosphere of the studio, a kind of blended perfume of periodical impecuniosity and much tobacco-smoke. This laxity, moreover, is to a great extent a tradition of art, which artists themselves do not a little to perpetuate. They are, or they affect to be, for the most part a simple-minded, demonstrative, impulsive, eccentric, vagabond race, even as Thackeray has drawn them in his novels. As a matter of fact, many, perhaps most of them, are the reverse of this—shrewd, hard-headed men of business, with as clear a conception as the most acute trader of the value of twenty shillings. But

social verdicts are based for the most part on general impressions ; and the popular view of the painter—speaking now, as always, of the guild, not of the individual member of it—is that the calling which he elects to follow lacks definitiveness of status, and that it is not calculated to promote those serious, methodical habits which form an integral part of the foundation of English society.

If this sentiment were to be exhaustively analysed, it would be found that there entered into it considerations which apply to other professions. Attorneys or solicitors, general practitioners, and even illustrious physicians in the daily intercourse of society labour under nearly the same disadvantages as artists. It is therefore natural and logical to ask what is the social differentia of this group of professional men ? It is to be found, unless we greatly mistake, in the fact that they are each of them in the habit of receiving money payments direct from those with whom they consort nominally on a footing of social equality. All professional men make their livelihood out of the public in some shape or other. The only thing is that some of them receive the money of the public through an agent, or middleman, and that others do not. A barrister has no immediate pecuniary dealings with his client. An author has no immediate pecuniary dealings with those who read his books or articles. A beneficed clergyman is independent of his congregation for his income. Artists, attorneys, surgeons, dentists, physicians, are paid by fee, or they send in their account and receive

—or at least look for—a cheque in settlement. But this is exactly what a tailor, a wine merchant, a butcher, a grocer, or any other retail dealer does. Thus we arrive at the conclusion that whatever the social disadvantage at which artists, attorneys, and doctors may find themselves, it arises from precisely the same cause as that which exists in the case of persons who derive their income from nothing that can be called a liberal or a learned trade.

To pass on to two of the conditions which, at the outset of this argument, were loosely enumerated as tests of professional dignity. The sphere of the influence exercised by artists, as by actors and musicians, is necessarily *restricted* within comparatively narrow limits. Neither great paintings, nor good acting, nor musical masterpieces exercise a very appreciable power on our every-day life, and the conduct and current of affairs. A fine picture makes a stir in the artistic world; but it does not mould the thoughts, or regulate the aspirations, or inspire the mind of the world outside. Excellence in the performance of a leading character in a clever play is the theme of much conversation in society; but it is impossible to say that influence attaches to the merit thus displayed. The sentiments to which the artist gives expression on the stage may produce a deep result, and have before now given an impulse to movements which have almost culminated in revolutions. In the same way, the language with which the singer accompanies the melody may convey the most profound, the most tragic



effects. But in each of these cases it is the author, the dramatist, or the poet who speaks; and the actor or the vocalist is, so far as the sentiment which he contributes his share, but only his share, to eliciting, little more than the organ which the soul of literature inspires, and through which it speaks. In a scarcely less degree it may be predicated of the professions of the attorney and the doctor, that they are without those opportunities of moving the mind of the thinking public in any given direction. A physician, who is a great authority in his consulting-room, acquires a considerable position; and from the pedestal of that position he may speak with the certainty of being listened to on many non-professional subjects. But he has not gained this authority as doctor. An attorney, again, may be an election agent, and thus affect the destiny of parties in the State. But this branch of the profession is only a rare and accidental development of his calling. The more closely the matter is looked at, the more apparent does it become that none of the professional classes—as professional classes—can be said to have the same power of appealing to the intellect and the moral convictions which supply rules for the guidance of every-day life, and of colouring the views of the people on religious or political matters, as the writer, the clergyman, the barrister who takes a prominent place in his profession. The barrister who practises in court, much more the judge who sits on the bench, materially and perceptibly assists in the manufacture, modelling, and remodelling of the public

law, which is a distinct department of public ethics. The author assists his readers, sensibly or insensibly, in their verdicts on public men and public questions—in their formation of those ideas of right and wrong, whose conscious or unconscious influence is the good or evil genius of their mortal existence. Of the clergyman—the preacher—there is no need to speak.

We have said that the esteem in which society holds these different orders of professional labourers is closely proportioned to the extent and character of their influence on the public mind. We may go farther, and say that the State in the recognition of their services judges them by the same standard. Those who rise to the highest titular rank by their own efforts, when they are not chosen on the ground of convenient political ability or party service, or immense wealth expended in a cause of which the Government of the day approves, or of brilliant exploits on the sea and on the field—exploits which decide the fate of nations—are selected from some one or other of the classes that we have just been considering. Artists are occasionally advanced to the honour of knighthood or baronetcy; so are doctors; and such fortune sometimes may come to attorneys. But, unlike the barrister, no attorney can be said to carry the wig of the chancellor, or the robe of the peer, in his bag. Has the coronet which the distinguished author may bequeath to his children ever been placed upon the painter's head? Can *Æsculapius* himself, in his most sanguine moments, anticipate any dignity analogous to the bishop's mitre, which every

clergyman may consider he potentially packs up in the portmanteau that he takes with him when he leaves home to do duty for a friend, and possibly to preach before a royal or illustrious personage? No doubt, it may be said with truth that in these days representative members of all professions consort together, and are treated in society on a footing of perfect equality; but we have attempted here to go a little beneath the surface, and to hazard a possible explanation of what are perhaps foolish prejudices and superstitions.

## CHAPTER XIX.

### SOCIETY AND POLITICS.

Gradual Diminution of Social Influences upon Politics — The Aristocratic Principle still a powerful one—English System of Statesmanship essentially Aristocratic—Statesmanship in Families favourable to this Tendency—Place of the Country House in our Political System—Clubs: their General Aspect and Political Significance—Peculiar Excellencies of the Conservative Club System—Explanations of this—Social Structure of Conservative Party—Political *Salons*: their Decline, and Reasons for this Decline—Lady Palmerston's Drawing-room—Prospects of the *Salon*.

It is the fashion to say that, since the English people have been taken into partnership in the work of national government by the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867, and we have fairly entered upon the broad road which is thought to lead to pure democracy, the influence of rank and fashion, in other words, of what is called "society," upon politics has ceased to exist. Before 1832, the history of English politics was largely identical with the history of English society. It is within the last half-century that the members of the great English families have perceived that they can no longer, by judicious alliances, keep the game of government to themselves. A hundred years ago, Burke was indebted for his entrance to Parliament to Lord Rockingham, who, seeing that his administration was, as Charles Townshend puts it, "mere lutestring: pretty summer wear, but quite unfit for winter," made the young

Irishman—then chiefly known, as Macaulay reminds us, “by a little treatise in which the style and reasoning of Bolingbroke were mimicked with exquisite skill”—his private secretary. Pitt, Chatham’s son though he was, commenced his parliamentary career under the ægis of a great governing house, the Lowthers. Canning was a connection and protégé of the Duke of Portland. “One of the most curious features,” remarks a writer in *Blackwood’s Magazine*,\* “of this obsolete day is the manner in which the country was disposed of. No game of whist in one of the lordly clubs of St. James’s Square was ever more exclusively played. It was simply a question whether His Grace of Bedford would be content with a quarter or half a cabinet, or whether the Marquis of Rockingham would be satisfied with two-fifths, or the Earl of Shelburne should have all or should share the power with the Duke of Portland. In all these barterings and borrowings we never hear the name of the nation. No whisper announces that there is such a thing in existence as the people. No allusion ever proceeds from the stately lips or offends the ‘ears polite,’ of the embroidered conclave referring to either the interests, feelings, or necessities of the nation.” Nor is less curious testimony to this vanished state of things contained in a letter addressed by Burke to his original patron, Lord Rockingham:—“Lord Shelburne,” he writes, “still continues in administration, though as adverse and as much disliked as ever. The Duke of Grafton continues to bear the old complaint of

\* No. cccl., p. 754.

his situation and his genuine desire of holding it as long as he can. At the same time, Lord Shelburne gets loose too ; I know that Lord Camden, who adhered to him in the late divisions, has given him up and gone over to the Duke of Grafton. The Bedfords are horribly frightened at all this, for fear of seeing the table which they had so well covered, and at which they sat down with so good an appetite, kicked down in the scuffle. They find things not ripe at present for bringing in Grenville, and that any capital move just now would only betray their weakness in the closet and in the nation."

Absolutely antiquated, of course, such a state of things as this has long since been. Nevertheless, it would be a grave mistake to conclude that the great houses are without influence on the formation of cabinets, or that there are no points of contact between aristocratic drawing-rooms and a Parliament in which the popular chamber is elected by household suffrage. That the English masses can secure as the head of an administration any statesman upon whom they have set their hearts, and that the Government which is to have the national confidence must be composed of men approved by the constituencies, is certain. Still there is left a fair margin in which the machinery of society may be brought to bear upon the politics and politicians of the day. In the case of a Liberal Government taking office, the Whigs may hold the balance between the left and right wings, and the Whigs have eminent social resources at their disposal.

In the same way with the Conservatives, the Tories of the old school are not yet an extinct race; and a moderate Conservative Premier would hardly venture to form a cabinet without consulting the feelings of his patrician Tory supporters, or to decide upon a legislative programme for a single session that had not been previously considered by the same illustrious depositaries of aristocratic power. Neither Whig nor Tory nobles would, indeed, any longer dream of opposing to the last a popular demand earnestly and resolutely made. On the other hand, no representative of the people would commence with defying the power of the great titular and territorial magnates. Negotiation, compromise, mutual concession are the notes of modern statesmanship. The privileged classes constitute a powerful organisation, and they know that if these privileges are to be preserved there must be the tacit understanding that whatever, in the last resort, the multitude wills, it shall have.

But because it recognises in this order of things the decree of manifest destiny, it has no idea of surrendering everything to the popular impulse. Democratic as our tendencies may be, there never was a time when rank and fashion, when everything which is comprised in the single word position, had so signal an opportunity of influencing the popular mind. The reason for this has been to some extent explained in the preceding chapters. The process that has been going on for years is that of levelling up. The increase of the wealth of the middle classes, and

their intermarriage with their social superiors, have caused them to assimilate the tastes and prejudices of their new connections. Property grows, and the holders of property naturally take the colour of their views from those who are above them, and not from those who are below. The consequences of this, whether socially or politically considered, are identical. It is the aristocratic principle which dominates our political, as it dominates our social, system. The statesman who was indiscreetly to proclaim the truth from the house-tops might probably suffer for his communicativeness. The most powerful Prime Minister whom England has seen for many years, Lord Beaconsfield, acted upon a clear recognition of this fact in the appointments which he made during the latter period of his office to various posts in his administration—those of Sir Michael Hicks Beach to the Secretaryship of State for the Colonies; of Colonel Stanley to the Ministry of War; of Lord Sandon to the Board of Trade; of Mr. E. Stanhope to the Under Secretaryship for India; of Lord George Hamilton to the Vice-Presidency of the Council; of Sir M. W. Ridley to the Under Secretaryship of the Home Office; of Sir H. Selwin Ibbetson to the Secretaryship of the Treasury; of Mr. J. G. Talbot to the Secretaryship of the Board of Trade. The influence of appointments made on such principles as these extends farther than might be thought. It will be felt more in the future even than in the present. Each of the gentlemen whose names have been mentioned above has not only ability, but great advantages



of birth, station, and connection. Some one of their number may possibly furnish a future Premier ; most of them may reasonably expect a place in some Conservative cabinet. In fact, their very appointment to the offices indicated was the beginning of their apprenticeship to the work of Cabinet Ministers. Thus the aristocratic principle in politics may be viewed in process of transmission, and in this way there is a guarantee afforded that a considerable portion of the most important administrative work of the nation will be in the hands of men who have the ear of that section of the community which is often used as a synonym for good society.

Hence, it is not surprising that statesmanship should have a tendency to become as much a tradition in some families as the gout, a quality subtly communicated from father to son. The most valuable political training which a young man can have is given him by surrounding circumstances and associations, and is wholly apart from the education of books. Aristocracies exist by force, democracies by ideas ; and English statesmanship, at its most vigorous epochs, has never been exclusively, or even mainly, allied with literary scholarship. If the reading of books be the measure of knowledge, then the young men of the higher classes of English society are the most ignorant in the world. If an acquaintance with the theories of philosophers and the speculations of historians be necessary to enable them to render their country sound political service, then that service will never be rendered by them. But if

## *SOCIETY AND POLITICS.*

there be such a thing as education without books, and if that is the most valuable education of all, it is as well that matters should remain as they are. The science of life can only be learned from life itself; and wherever human nature is—in the senate or the street, the court or the club—it is pretty much the same. Our young men nowadays rattle round the world in the course of the grand tour. They study the idiosyncrasies of their countrymen and countrywomen in the drawing-room, on the race-course, in the park, and the entire process is one of unconscious education. The knowledge of events and places which is picked up from books is the possession of one day and the loss of the next. The knowledge which practical experience gives remains.

Nor is it only that the character of the English nation and the genius of our English political system are favourable to the exercise of social influences upon politics. Social influences, actively and continuously felt in the region of public life, are implied in our system of party government. If in ordinary times polite society seems to be indifferent to the issues of party politics, there are not quite unknown ladies who are born stateswomen, who have a natural turn for forecasting parliamentary combinations, and who calculate the probable figures of the division list with the eagerness of junior whips. For the most part, it is only heroic questions, or questions in which the chief questions concerned are easy to grasp, and appeal directly to the imagination, that have any large interest for society.

If a measure were introduced for disestablishing and disendowing the National Church, thousands of feminine swords would metaphorically flash from their scabbards. Again, such problems as the Eastern Question have a social aspect as well as a profound political significance. Its broad issues have been fairly intelligible, or have, at least, seemed so, without the accompaniment of figures and statistics. Moreover, they have been fraught with much of that purely personal attraction which politics so often lack. The rivalry between the two most distinguished statesmen of the day has been brought into prominent and sensational relief. The progress of the bloody strife between Turk and Russian gave just those opportunities for the display of sympathy which society loves. Concerts or fêtes were constantly being held in aid of one or other of the combatants; and fashionable sisters of mercy not only were able to occupy themselves with a good work, but had the satisfaction of deriving from it a fair measure of social excitement.

The country house is also an important point of convergence between society and politics. The country house system is as distinctively national as the British Constitution, and the country house season is one which may be said to last all the year round. The English country house is a microcosm of the chief forces that are at work in modern society. If it is a good thing, and one which has tended to the partial obliteration of the hard and fast lines which separate class from class, that our aristocracy should open their parks upon

## *SOCIETY AND POLITICS.*

occasion to all who like to make decorous holiday within their limits, a corresponding social good is done when they open their houses, as freely as they now do, to men who represent something more than the principles of idleness and enjoyment. To a large percentage of visitors the season now spoken of is but a synonym for the shooting season. Even the sportsmen are not deficient in a certain representative character. There are among them men of business as well as pleasure; members of all professions; gentlemen who, as a rule, never know what is a day's idleness, as well as others who have never known what is a day's work. Bishops, or some other highly-placed divines, will give an air of eminent respectability to the gathering, and suggestively symbolise the union of Church and State. A traveller who has newly returned to British soil, after years of exploration and wandering, is also a decided acquisition. Professors are found to relax a good deal of their professorial dignity. Highly scientific jurists, as well as natural philosophers, very often blend admirably with the other guests; and it is interesting to watch how an erudite historian, who has delivered a little lecture of a rather stiff character in the afternoon on the remains of an ancient British camp, becomes pleasantly chatty on common-place topics at dinner, and shows that he has a keen appreciation of the ludicrous over a cigar in the smoking-room. It may be thought that one regulation character has been omitted from this catalogue. Where, it will be possibly said, is the wit of the company? The truth is, he is not always to be found. His

jesters are becoming familiar and wearisome, and though "society" likes to be amused, it has a highly edifying taste for instruction as well. So, instead of the punsters pure and simple, it invites to its houses professors who can be facetious when wanted, or philosophers who can either solve the riddle of the universe or assist in the guessing of a double acrostic. In these blended elements the political fills a prominent place. It was said by Moore, the poet, that there was no receipt for taming a Radical like an invitation to Bowood. There is no doubt that if the secret political history of the past forty years could be written in the frank fashion of the "Greville Memoirs," it would be found that in many instances a judicious course of Whig hospitality during the months of autumn had subdued the wild fervour of the hitherto intractable and irreconcilable democrat.

While the country house, as an institution, situated in that extensive borderland where politics and society meet, is common to both the great political parties in the State, it has been reserved for the Conservatives to achieve a unique success with the club system. And here it may be desirable to say a few preliminary words on the general question of clubs. Clubs may generally be described as embodying the principle of co-operation in its application to tavern life. They have been of great service, both political and social: in the latter capacity they have done an immense deal towards the creation of a sound body of public opinion; in the former, they have consolidated the sense of

## *SOCIETY AND POLITICS.*

unity, and have increased that mutual knowledge which is essential for the keeping together of the various members of a political organisation. How far clubs possess that quality of economy which is one of the advantages that co-operation usually bestows may be doubted. At some of the older established institutions, which have large balances in their bankers' hands, it is indeed possible to procure the necessities and luxuries of life at cost price, and to eat dinners for a third of the sum which they would cost at an ordinary restaurant; but it is a delusion to suppose that, in the majority of clubs, a gentleman can live as cheaply as he may do if he has his meals in his own apartments, or even at well-selected taverns. There are certainly very few clubs in London at which it would be possible to have so good and so complete a dinner as may now be purchased at more than one London restaurant for three shillings and sixpence. What the club man does get, what he could not get elsewhere, and what he may well be content to pay for, is a very considerable degree of luxury and of comfort. For all practical purposes he is the inhabitant of a palace, and so long as he pays his subscription and does not egregiously violate the laws of the institution, he need not fear that he will be exiled from it. The social advantages of clubs are apt to be exaggerated even more than the economical ones. Membership of a really first-rate club does undoubtedly confer upon a man some degree of social distinction. But then, it is rather the hall-mark which stamps the value of the article than

the article itself. It is the formal recognition of social qualities or advantages which have an existence perfectly independent of the club, and which are indeed the primary cause of membership. But of society, in the sense of fellowship, a club does not necessarily give anything; indeed, the genius of modern club life may be almost described as that of isolation. A newcomer into the community will probably find that he is not the less completely alone because he happens to be in the company of some score of his fellow-creatures.

To belong to a club does not necessarily carry a personal acquaintance with any one of the members. In some clubs, where there exists a less rigid system of etiquette, it is not thought irregular for one member to address another of whom he knows nothing if they happen to occupy contiguous chairs in the smoking-room; in such matters as these, as in many others, every London club of importance has special features of its own. Clubs themselves present almost as many and various characteristics as do the gentlemen frequenting them. To some men a club is a mere lounge, at which they spend perhaps two or three hours daily; perhaps not as much as two or three hours a week. The more superficial specimen of a club lounge enters the morning-room hurriedly, just looks into the candidate's book, and then, after a few words of casual gossip with a slight acquaintance, meets a gentleman with whom he is on more intimate terms, and arranges perhaps some question of business or of pleasure. Others there are who are regularly to be found at

their club on certain days, or at certain hours in every day, during the week; while to others, again, the club is not merely a second home, but home itself. As are the clubmen so are the clubs. At some there is a general air of easy familiarity, at others there is as much ceremony as at a State function; at some members sit down to dinner without compunction in morning dress, at others this is a sin, which would only be excused if the diner were on the point of setting out on a journey.

It is not only the clubs which are specially affected to one or other of the two great political parties, that subserve, in some way or other, a political purpose. These do not, of course, charge themselves with an evangelising mission in statesmanship, as the purely political clubs do. Political committees, charged with the administration of a fund for political purposes, whose business it is to watch over parliamentary elections, and to see that its members do not too flagrantly violate, in their political action, the principles of the party to which they belong, are not unknown in clubs; but if these bodies are wise, they will use their power very sparingly. It was not considered a prudent act, on the part of the committee of the Conservative Club in St. James's Street, when it expelled the first Lord Westbury, at the time he was Solicitor-General in Lord Aberdeen's Government; nor, in the general opinion of politicians who were also men of the world, did the Reform Club exhibit much greater judgment when it exiled a few years ago,



Mr. Ripley, the member for Bradford, on the ground that he had not shown himself a good member of the Liberal party. The Carlton Club has shown more sagacity, and has never recognised the existence of the political committee, which has now at the Junior Carlton Club become a dead letter. Just as the late Lord Derby was a member of Brooks's to the end of his life, so it was only a few years ago that Mr. Gladstone removed his name from the Carlton list. When, in 1852, Mr. Gladstone was personally insulted by some Conservative members of the Carlton, the public opinion of the club was emphatically against the perpetrators of the aggression. Clubs, as a connecting-link between society and statesmanship, are of proved utility, but their utility very largely depends upon the skill and judgment with which they are managed; if the tactics adopted at all savour of inquisition, they are sure to prove a failure.

As for the true explanation of the different fortunes that have waited on the development of the club principle among Conservatives and Liberals, it must be sought for in the radical divergences between the composition of the two parties, and the traditions, feelings, and prejudices of their members. The Conservative is by nature a clubbable creature, in the modern acceptation of the word. Liberals and Conservatives each have a *cachet* of exclusiveness of their own; but the Conservative exclusiveness differs from the Liberal in this: that it does not militate against—that, in fact, it rather ministers to—freedom in club life. Proof of the fact is to be

found in the existence of the Carlton, the club of the Conservative party, in a sense in which the Liberals have no club at all. Unlike the Reform, unlike Brooks's, the Carlton is used equally by the official leaders, the titled and patrician chiefs of the party, and by the rank and file of their followers. Great peers, small squires, merchants, and traders meet together on a common ground, and every Conservative has a club acquaintance—and, for the most part, a club acquaintance only—with his accepted chieftains. There is no such comprehensiveness or homogeneity as this about the Liberal clubs. The ordinary members of the party make the Reform their house of call—as do several hundreds of other gentlemen who have no occupation in particular, and whose political views are conveniently colourless. The leaders of the party go to Brooks's. The Carlton is, in fact, what it pretends to be—a purely politico-social institution, the accepted rendezvous and head-quarters of the accredited representatives of a party. The Reform Club lacks political unity among its members, and the pervading consciousness of a political purpose. On the other hand, the Liberal leaders receive their political followers with hospitality and warmth at their private residences; and, while of club intercourse there may be less among the Liberals, of private visiting and social hospitality—open house and friendly entertainment—there is probably more.

Nor is it difficult to see why clubs exactly suit the genius of the Conservative party. Modern Con-

servatism is successful precisely in proportion as it is an alliance between the aristocratic and democratic elements. The attitude of mind and bearing favourable for the perpetuation of this alliance has long been cultivated among the Conservatives to a degree that was scarcely possible among the Liberals. The typical Tory has been a large landowner, and if not a master of fox-hounds, a tolerably assiduous votary of the hunting-field. Circumstances have made it his part to ingratiate himself with his inferiors, and unconsciously he has learned to study and exhibit in his own person that air of well-bred condescension, of frank, unsupercilious patronage, which answers so well with Englishmen in the bulk. There could be no better kind of hereditary preparation for the mixed régime of club life than this; there could be no better opportunity of cheaply, yet effectively, satisfying the social aspirations of political followers than the Conservative club. The manner to which he has been born; the genial hearty address which seems to mean so much, and really means so little; the bluff English courtesy which has been picked up, or inherited from ancestors who picked it up, at the covert side and in daily conversations with farmers and labourers, serves its turn admirably when it is reproduced, with the necessary modifications, in Pall Mall.

As a social instrument used for political purposes, the salon can scarcely be now said to fill a very definite place in England. English political society has grown

too large for its representatives to be contained within the limits of a single drawing-room; or it may be that the very dimensions which society has attained have inspired English ladies, who might, under other circumstances, have been dictatresses, with a profound impression of the hopelessness of engaging in the attempt to regulate so chaotic an empire. English ladies who are capable of controlling a drawing-room have not ceased to exist, but, with a very few exceptions, their gifts and powers are now exercised in different areas. The best society in England, while possessing a strong political infusion, is not exclusively political; it is the object of those who govern it to include in it representatives of all that is distinguished in art, science, literature, war, and commerce. Even Prime Ministers no longer confine their guests to those who are politicians merely, and the State dinners given on Her Majesty's birthday and other occasions are graced by the presence of eminent artists, authors, and philosophers.

It is, therefore, rather because the conditions of English society have changed that the salon, in the sense in which it is usually spoken of, has almost ceased to exist, than because no opportunities or inducements are to be found to influence politics through society. When Lady Palmerston died, in 1868, there passed away the great social queen of her era, and she has had no successor since. The extraordinary popularity of Lord Palmerston was not a plant of sudden growth. On the contrary, Lord Palmerston was for a long time extremely the reverse of popular. He married, and

a change took place. For most of his popularity and much of his influence the husband was indebted to the social tact and the salon of his wife. A little more than a quarter of a century ago, Lord John Russell, on a memorable occasion, dismissed Lord Palmerston from the Foreign Office. The exile was short; but it was short only because, whoever ruled in Downing Street, Lady Palmerston ruled in society. The world not merely sympathised with Lord Palmerston as against Lord John Russell: it applauded him; and only a few days after the split in the Cabinet took place, Lady Palmerston gave a party, which may be remembered as historical, and at which was present every person of political, social, or intellectual position. The *Times* contained a complete list of the guests, under the significant heading: "The Expelled Minister;" and Mr. Disraeli, who was of the company, declared to Lord Granville that he had made a mistake when, a few nights previously, he had said, "There *was* a Palmerston."

Lady Palmerston received not only at night, but in the day. All her invitation-cards were written with her own hand. By consummate skill she preserved for her assemblies the *cachet* of distinction; and every one who was invited to them regarded the invitation as an honour, although he was not singular in the enjoyment of it. There was no resort in London so interesting to the man of the world or so useful to the politician. It was the one place where the pulse of the world might be infallibly felt, and

Ministers went there to ascertain the true currents of popular and polite opinion. The place left vacant by the death of Lady Palmerston, more than one great lady has done her best to fill. But their invitations are in the hands of, and are issued, as the names of the invited are written by, secretaries, whips, and clerks. Attendance at these assemblies is as much a business as a pleasure. Almost the same thing may be said of many great political dinners. The great leaders of the two chief political parties in the State cannot, and will not, study the arts of social entertainment. Dinners and receptions are given, but they are given—as invitations to them are accepted—as matters of necessity and not of choice. Nothing can be easier than to exaggerate the influence exercised upon political life, whether by clubs or salons. It is perfectly true that the club, as has been already said, has answered better in the hands of Conservatism than of Liberalism. But the inference is, not so much that the successful organisation of Conservatism is the result of club life, as that particular reasons conducive to club success exist in the case of Conservatives and not among the Liberals. The first essential in the development of club life is a supply of moderately young men, tolerably well provided with pocket money. These are the special possession of Conservatism, while, in addition to these, the Conservatives have an element of social and political stability which the Liberals have not. In the same way, to search for Lord Palmerston's popularity and power in Lady Palmerston's drawing-room is to confuse

cause and effect. The period was one of political indifference, and Cambridge House was a distinguished rendezvous. It was the former of these circumstances which assisted the latter, not the latter which created the former. So far as any permanent political leverage is concerned, the age of salons is as completely past as that of chivalry. Individual politicians may be amenable to social pressure, and some stray irreconcilable may be bought off by what he considers social promotion. But a new irreconcilable will at once disclose himself, and the difficulty will only be avoided, not averted. At the same time, though the salon is no longer powerful, it may be useful. It may be convenient to politicians of the same way of thinking that they should know where to find each other at stated times, for the purposes of confidential talk. This opportunity the salon may continue to afford them, but then so, for that matter, will the club.

## CHAPTER XX.

### CROWN AND CROWD.

Disposition of the Multitude to acquiesce in Existing Régime—Influence of the British Constitution upon National Character—Attitude of Masses towards Monarch and Ministers—Reception given in Public to Sovereign and Leading Statesmen of the Day—Nevertheless New Influences at work among the Masses—The Organisation of Public Opinion in Large Constituencies—The Caucus—Gradual Movements towards Democracy—The Democracy ultimately supreme in our Political System—Effects which this Supremacy must have on Statesmanship and Policy—"Employer and Servant" Theory of Imperial Administration—Its Dangers, and how these Dangers may be met—Checks upon the Democratic Tendency of the Times—General Diffusion of the Aristocratic Principle—This illustrated in the Relation of (1) House of Commons, (2) House of Lords, to Masses—The Sovereign—Influence of the Crown on Politics, and Relation of Sovereign to Subject.

It is a much easier matter to give a general account of the place occupied by the educated classes in regard to our political system than to indicate precisely the relations existing between that system and the multitude. The English masses are not indisposed to accept the political opinion which is manufactured for them. In this, as in other matters, they are, for the most part, creatures of habit, and as long as the shoe does not pinch, they make no demand for political innovation. They look not to theories, but to facts. While work is plentiful and wages good, the British workman has not been accustomed to trouble himself with the principles of statesmanship. In England,



unlike France and other European countries, there is not present to the mind of the ordinary citizen the apprehension of never-ending changes in the political régime under which he lives. If he is the conscious victim of abuses, he will, in the last resort, enter a demand for legislative remedies. After the long continuance of neglect on the part of those in power of all which concerns him most, he will avail himself, perhaps, of the machinery of an agitation which his superiors will have done much to place in his hands, and which they will themselves have suggested. Thus it was that the riots preceding the Reform Act of 1832 had their origin; in the same way the movement which was the prelude to the Reform Act of thirty-five years later, and which culminated in the breaking down of the Hyde Park railings, would in all probability never have existed, had it not been for the fact that reform was for many years antecedently the stalking-horse of parties, and that on this occasion its importance was insisted on by every speaker on every Liberal platform.

What the English multitude requires from the State is much what it requires from the private employers of its labour—it asks that it shall be fairly treated, that it shall not be the victim of any exceptional inferiority, disadvantages, or disqualification. Periodical revolutions leave their impress upon the individual character of a people, and in a country in which dynastic and constitutional changes are at any moment liable to occur, a habit of fickleness and suspicion will be generated in the subjects. But for the very reason that the English

masses themselves are not greatly occupied by, or interested in constitutional discussions, their political teachers and rulers ought to be careful that constitutional issues should not be raised. Whenever there is a discussion in Parliament as to whether a particular act or policy is in conformity with constitutional law, so far as any effect is produced upon the multitude at large, it can scarcely be salutary. As far as the practical working of the Constitution goes, it depends, as financial credit depends, upon confidence. So long as the English masses have confidence in the wisdom and moderation of their statesmen, the cry for reorganising the Constitution will never be of much volume. If the study of history could at all influence the feeling of the working classes towards the representative of English monarchy, the result would probably not be in the direction of loyalty. In the popular histories and in some of the popular periodicals which circulate amongst the working classes, the views given of monarchy and of other established institutions, are eminently unfavourable. Yet when the sovereign appears in public the reception is one of the highest enthusiasm—the very men who a few hours previously may have given vent to sentiments positively seditious are borne away on the tide of general feeling, and applaud the pageant to the echo.

Let us suppose that Her Majesty has to-day opened the session of her Imperial Parliament, and that, as is sure to have been the case, very many of her loyal lieges have assisted in some part or other of the ceremony.

Have there been any disloyal lieges? Strolling across the Green Park, after having witnessed the celebration, one may have encountered a moody-looking malodorous pair, some of whose criticisms on the monarchical principle are but too audible. One, at least, of these scowling but perfectly harmless democrats the spectator may have seen before to-day. His chin is rough and stubbly and of a dirty blue colour, with a beard of some days' growth. He has no linen visible. In his mouth is a short pipe, from which he discharges jerky blasts of intolerable smoke; and as he leans across the iron railings in converse with his companion he points with the finger of scornful menace in the direction of Buckingham Palace. The spectacle of the charity-girls and the Duke of York's boys, who have been marched out to catch a glimpse of their Sovereign, incites him to wrath. The words "mockery" and "despotism," "tyrant" and "oppressor," "prince" and "flunkey," "reason," "humanity," and "republic," drop at intervals from his lips. But where was he to be seen a few hours ago, and what was he doing? Conspicuous among these demonstratively loyal subjects of Her Majesty, carried away by that irresistible contagion of loyal enthusiasm which a great crowd communicates, was this terrible republican, the democratic fire-brand of the discussion forum, the modern disciple of Marat and Tom Paine. This is no exceptional experience. Whenever it is known that either the Queen or, as Her Majesty's representatives, the Prince and Princess of Wales are about to appear in

public, a tremor of anticipatory enthusiasm asserts its presence in thoroughfares. Men, women, and children gather in little knots and wait till the royal carriage approaches. Frequently the interval of waiting is long. That they do not mind. Be it summer or winter, at the risk of sun-stroke or the certainty of getting drenched to the skin, the patient and most loyal populace will not disperse till the carriage in which monarchy is seated has driven past, and the national devotion to the monarchical principle has expressed itself in a series of shouts that rend the air.

Scarcely less impressive in its way is the public reception which, especially on great occasions, is accorded to the English statesmen whose names are household words, whether they are past or present members of the Cabinet. The scene is Palace Yard, and there is a great debate expected. Every minute the enclosure grows fuller and fuller of cabs and carriages, and of masses of enthusiastic and excited spectators as well. They form an avenue in front of the entrance into the great hall, and they greet their favourite statesman with volleys of applause. The rank and file of the representatives of the people pass without general recognition, till some statesman, whose person is as familiar as his career, makes his appearance, and is greeted with salvoes of acclamation. There is nothing very noticeable about the great man. He is of the middle height; he stoops a little; he has a lightish beard and whiskers, which are just

tinged with grey ; he wears spectacles ; and he walks with rather a quick step, looking neither to the right nor left. As he passes he bows more than once ; and who shall say that the sound of the ringing plaudits does not fall pleasantly on his ears and convey a comfortable hint to his anxious soul ! He is, perhaps, not exactly what would be called a heaven-born statesman. He is not an orator like Canning ; he does not display the skill of a Palmerston in fathoming the secrets of European diplomacy. But he has the confidence of his countrymen, who know that he will make no great mistake, and that their main interests are safe in his keeping. Presently there is another arrival. He has just left his carriage, and as he proceeds bravely to run the gauntlet of the crowd the face of a lady looks out from the brougham. His step is light and firm ; his face pale as death, but strong and resolute. He is a man who has never quailed before an angry crowd ; as a politician, he has always had his foot in the stirrup, and as a speaker, has always carried his lance in rest. But, in truth, he has seldom had occasion to dread the clamouring of an angry mob. He has been the people's hero, and the sounds which have almost always greeted him have been those that testified an unshakable belief in his genius and his virtues. It is a curious, even a menacing, conflict of noises which awaits him now. There are cheers, and there are groans ; there are hisses, and there are cheers again. He walks very swiftly ; no muscle quivers ; the only change visible

in his countenance is that the pallor of his cheeks grows deadlier, and his figure more erect. By what curious fatality is it that this statesman—who has been before the public for well-nigh half a century, and during most of that time has been among those who share the responsibility for the conduct of the Queen's Government—is followed by the veteran and victorious chief, who has been during nearly the whole of this period his peculiar rival and special foe? By what strange chance does he, this hero of the fiercest parliamentary fights which, since 1832, the century has seen, on this afternoon, above all others, select as his approach to the illustrious chamber in which he has won himself a place the great hall, before whose portals are ranged the outside critics of parliamentary statesmanship?

Significant as such scenes as those which have just been described are, and not more general than deep as is the belief in the existing order, new forces have begun unmistakably to assert themselves in the popular mind. On all sides there may now be witnessed what may best be spoken of as the organisation of popular opinion. The spread of education, the extension of the newspaper press, the multiplication of lectures, and of a variety of agencies for bringing the working classes together, all tend to make them think more upon the great questions of contemporary politics, and to cast about for new ways of giving effect to the opinions at which they thus arrive. One of the results of this state of things is seen in a tendency to push institutions

to an extreme. Successive acts of parliamentary reform, culminating in household suffrage, have imbued the masses with a strong sense of political power. They have come to realise more than they have ever done before the truth that parliamentary institutions should be representative in something more than name. This movement is one which is really altogether new. It is, perhaps, the first in a series of great changes of which no one now living will witness the last. "It is too soon," wrote the late Mr. Walter Bagehot, in his introduction\* to the most useful and practical work on the Constitution in the English language, "as yet to attempt to estimate the effect of the Reform Act of 1867. The Reform Act of 1832 did not for many years disclose its full consequences, and a writer in 1836 would have been sure to be mistaken in them. A new Constitution does not produce its full effect as long as all its subjects were reared under an old Constitution, as long as its statesmen were trained by that old Constitution. It is not really tested till it comes to be worked by statesmen and among a people neither of whom are guided by a different experience." Mr. Bagehot proceeds to illustrate this truth in an interesting and suggestive manner. The change of generation, he remarks, is as powerful as any change in political machinery or institutions. The entire spirit of politics was changed by the death of Lord Palmerston, and the disappearance from the stage of his contemporaries. "All through the period between 1832 and 1865, the

\* See Introduction to "The English Constitution," new ed., 1878.

pre-'32 statesmen, Lord Derby, Lord Russell, Lord Palmerston retained great power; Lord Palmerston to the last retained great prohibitive power. . . In consequence, at his death, a new generation all at once started into life; the pre-'32 all at once died out." In the same strain this acute and luminous writer goes on to remark that till latterly the nominal constituency was not the real constituency; that the mass of the ten-pound householders did not really form their own opinions, and did not exact of their representatives an obedience to these opinions; that they were in fact guided in their judgment by the better educated classes; that they preferred representatives from these classes, and gave their representatives much license.

In proportion as political opinion in the constituencies becomes organised the members of Parliament elected by those constituencies will become more and more their direct representatives. It does not, indeed, necessarily follow that when the new system has made its full results felt, these representatives will be mere delegates. Constituencies will always be attracted in many instances by men of great parts, and will allow such politicians in whom their confidence is reposed much independent liberty of action. Prominent among all the associations for the organising of opinion amongst the political electorate is what has come to be known as the Caucus.\*

\* The word "Caucus" is defined in Worcester's English Dictionary, published in Boston, Massachusetts, as a meeting of citizens or electors held for the purpose of nominating candidates for public offices, or for making arrangements to secure their election. It is a low word, and supposed to be a



"The aim of the Caucus," says a gentleman who, more than any other, is qualified to expound its true object and character, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, "is essentially democratic: it is to provide for the full and efficient system of representation of the will of the majority, and for its definite expression in the government of the people." First let it be briefly explained what the Caucus is. Every parliamentary borough is divided into a certain number of municipal wards. In each of these wards a meeting of all the members of the party is annually convened, with every possible provision to give it publicity and importance. The electors so brought together choose, first, their representatives to the general committee, the "Six Hundred" or "Four Hundred," as it may be called; second, a smaller number of representatives to the executive committee, consisting of perhaps twenty to fifty members; and lastly, a ward committee which acts as a canvassing committee at parliamentary elections, and which selects the candidates and controls the policy of the party in the ward at municipal contests. This last committee is as large as possible, and includes all who are willing to serve. It will be seen that the constituency itself elects all the committees, including the executive, which is

corruption—"calkers'," "caulkers'," meeting—a term applied to electioneering meetings held in a part of Boston where all the ship-business was carried on. Dr. Charles Mackay suggests, in a letter published in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, January 24, 1879, that the true root of the word is to be found in the Celtic "comh" (pronounced "co")—a prefix implying concord or agreement with—and "cuis," signifying cause, affair, concern, business, procedure, &c. From this comes "co-cuis," or "caucus"—a meeting of those who agree with the business in hand, whatever it may be—a packed meeting, in fact.

therefore in direct communication with and responsibility to the electors. In America the electors choose the primary committees, the primary committees in turn choose the general committee or Caucus, the Caucus chooses an executive, the executive a sub-committee, and the sub-committee a "boss" or chairman, who is thus as far as possible removed from the original electorate. It is hardly necessary to point out the importance of the distinction thus established between the English and American practice.

America is the home of the Caucus, and those who support the institution do not deny the fact that in America its existence coincides with grave political mischiefs. But they point to the facts already stated as showing that the Caucus in America differs materially from the English organisation, and they deny that, even in its American form, the Caucus is the sole or main cause of the evils complained of. Thus it is urged that if men of inferior capacity or doubtful character find seats in the House of Representatives, the same thing is unfortunately true of other representative assemblies, and that if a prize-fighter once represented New York, a member of the same profession not long ago represented a borough in Yorkshire. Again, as Mr. Chamberlain points out in an able article on the subject in the *Fortnightly Review*, November, 1878, the very fact that the greater issues of politics have long ago been settled in America—to say nothing of the absorbing passion for material wealth and well-being—may

explain why many men of education refuse their share of public duty. "A nation," he writes, "which has no Land Question, no Church Question, no Education Question, and no Foreign Policy, must purchase its advantages at the price of less sustained and vital interest in its legislative work." Further, it is pointed out, by way of reply to the criticisms upon the Caucus derived from trans-Atlantic experience, "America is foremost among the nations of the world in respect to the wide-spread intelligence of its citizens, the rapid development of its resources, the general respect for law and order, and the universal acceptance of the principles of liberty and freedom." If, it is argued, all this is compatible with the Caucus, surely the much-execrated machinery cannot be so very bad.

Two remarks about the Caucus may be made with confidence. It cannot be denied that it is an extension of the principles of party government, and that it tends to make the political power and wish of the individual elector more directly felt. As Mr. Chamberlain has said in words quoted above, the Caucus is an instrument for expressing and giving effect to the will of the majority. Therefore, it means the subordination of the will of the individual to the will of the many. But that is what our political party system involves already. Again, it is the age of association, and the Caucus is simply an association of ratepayers, who are parliamentary electors, to secure a parliamentary representative who is

fairly in accord with their views. They conceive, and experience seems to confirm the view, that they can secure this the more certainly by collective than by isolated and individual action. Now comes the objection—that the interest of the great bulk of the electors in the Caucus will soon flag, and that the reins will pass into the hands of half a dozen zealous workers, who will make politics an art of which they will be the sole masters. As Mr. Chamberlain and other champions of the system point out, this anticipation depends for its fulfilment on the hypothesis that the interest of the majority will fail in the manner predicted. As a matter of fact, we are told there is no reason to believe the sinister prophecy. In the chapter on Municipal Government in the former volume, the growth of an intense spirit of citizenship in our great towns has been traced. The men who interest themselves in municipal business are the men who will also interest themselves in political, and to suppose that a sudden paralysis is likely to overcome the energies of the inhabitants of these great centres of industry is to suppose that a process which has now been steadily and swiftly going on for years will be suddenly and decisively arrested.

Nor is it entirely reasonable to speak of the Caucus as over-riding the public opinion of the constituency in which it exists. The Caucus is public opinion—not its manufacture, but its expression. It is, of course, conceivable that at particular times and

seasons the Caucus may find that it has got out of accord with the public opinion which surrounds it. In this case, its decrees and deliberations are an empty farce, and it will be without practical authority till it has again brought itself into harmony with the majority whose organ it is. The Caucus is thus, at least, representative; occasionally it may be dominated by the superior will and opinion of individuals possessed of exceptional force of character; but, then, so are parties, and communities, and states. And it is certainly the most genuinely representative variety of political organisation which has ever been invented.

The Conservative party has attempted in some boroughs to imitate the organisation of its opponents, but hitherto without success. The traditions and practice of Conservatism are almost antagonistic to a democratic organisation such as that which we have described, and at the same time the need of any such system is less, because habits of discipline and subordination are more common in the Tory than in the Liberal ranks. What the Caucus is to Liberalism, that the action of political clubs, the deference paid to the wish of local coteries in the selection of parliamentary candidates, are to Conservatism. Further, it must be remembered that the Conservatives form a party which is always, more or less, organised on certain unmistakable social and constitutional lines. The Church, the aristocracy, the great interests of the country, are each of them organising agencies with the Conservatives. It is

only natural that a greater tendency to individualism should be developed amongst the Liberals than with their opponents, and this tendency has resulted in the multiplication of Liberal candidates on the eve of a contested election. Hence, there has been a division of the party in constituencies which frequently, when the existence of a Liberal majority was an undoubted fact, has been instrumental in bringing about a Conservative victory. The Caucus may not be liked, it may even be dreaded. Its associations are as unwelcome as its name. It may be most undesirable that any body, even though composed of the electors themselves, should stand between the member of Parliament and his constituency. But whether un-English or not, the Caucus exists and increases. At the present time the Liberal party in not less than one hundred constituencies is organised on the Birmingham model, and the number is constantly growing. It may be safely asserted that whatever other results may follow, the bulk of the electors having once been taken into confidence and consulted in the management of the party and choice of candidates will never again consent to go back to the old system of management by cliques and coteries. Under the circumstances the only practical course seems to be to accept it as a perhaps unwelcome, but certainly an inevitable condition of a democratic age.

Let us now trace this democratic principle of our time a little further, and watch its influence on the relations with the highest question of imperial policy.

For good or for evil, it seems we must accept the democratic view of our national policy not as that which is now established, but as that which will some day or other be established. This conception is very simple, and may be readily stated. According to it, just as the individual is the unit of the town ward, so is the town ward of the town council, and so is the town council of the Imperial Parliament. Parliament, ward, council, citizen, these are the chief notes in the democratic scale, the graduated series by whose successive stages we shall ultimately arrive at the highest sovereign expression of the national will. This fact, the ultimate supremacy of the people—that is, of the majority, the separate parts in the fabric of their supremacy being those which have been already described—is not unrecognised by contemporary statesmen. A very few years ago, a Minister of State who was then Foreign Secretary, in addressing a deputation waiting to learn the policy of the Government on foreign affairs of great moment, spoke of himself and his colleagues as “waiting for instruction from their employers”—the people. This expression of Lord Derby’s has been much criticised, but whether felicitous or not, it must be said to represent the actual facts of the case with an undoubted degree of truth. The executive has no appeal from the House of Commons, and the House of Commons is chosen by the ratepayers. What will be the power of these when a new generation of electors has arisen, and that a generation whose minds are educated, and

whose organisation, whether by the Caucus or any other instrumentality, is complete, is the great problem of the future. We live under a constitutional monarchy, which now fears no shocks of revolution ; which is absolutely impotent to pass a law, or to keep a minister, against whom the masses have unanimously declared, in place ; which is for all practical purposes controlled by the democracy. This view of the English Constitution will not be found in any of our philosophic histories, but it is none the less the true view, and that which henceforward English ministers must recognise, even though they do not care to proclaim it in words.

There are several reasons why the condition of things which has now been described may be looked forward to with comparatively little apprehension. Logically, the consequence of the master and servant theory, as it has been called, which Lord Derby enunciated would be, as a clever writer in a review \* has put it, the submission of all important questions to the popular vote : " If Government is not to direct opinion, but simply to register its decrees, then steps should be taken for enabling public opinion to pronounce its decrees in the hearing of all men. . . . Upon this theory there should have been some means of removing Lord Derby's doubts by the method of plebiscite, and the country should have been asked to vote upon some proposition, raising substantially

\* Mr. H. D. Traill, "The Democracy and Foreign Policy," *Nineteenth Century*, Nov. 1878.



the issue whether England should defend the integrity and independence of Turkey against invasion by Russia." But the master and servant theory, though fundamentally true, will never involve a precarious appeal of this kind. There are as many checks upon the practice of the theory as upon constitutional monarchy itself. Some of them are to be found in the temper, and some in the institutions of Englishmen. A nation which has been trained during centuries in the school of deference and subordination, and which has become habituated to a belief in the good faith and in the capacity of its public men, does not in a moment, or indeed at all, throw off its ideas and ways, in a sense of elation at its newly realised sovereignty. If it is henceforth to be more self-governed than ever, it has been undergoing for ages the education which of all others would best qualify it for that complete self-government. There is no danger of household suffrage, even when it includes the agricultural labourers, reducing society in England to its primitive atoms, and though the basis of government may have been broadened, there will not be as a consequence any pervading anarchy of administration. The greater the multitude, the greater the influence of the individual, and because the English electorate and the English proletariat are convertible terms the authority of the English statesman will not be gone. It is, indeed, conceivable—for this is the characteristic of all democracies—that the English constituencies may be more liable

than hitherto to be carried away by sudden gusts of passion which sweep all before them, and it is precisely these impulses which the statesman will have either to utilise or to control. But because some of the forces with which he has to work are new, the influence of statesmanship will not be less than it has always been in England. More insight, more courage, more candour may be wanted, and when these qualities are forthcoming the authority of the individual statesman and his colleagues will still be paramount.

The last attribute just named, that of candour, suggests one or two important considerations in the theory and practice of English statesmanship under the new democratic régime. The employer and servant theory need not be so interpreted that it requires the perpetual reference of the policy of the minister to the masses for their approval. If it is the fact that the masses are in the last resort the arbiters of the position, it must be desirable that ministers should boldly recognise the truth. What, then, is the important question, are the arts by which the confidence and good will of the English masses are to be won? As were the ten-pound householders, so are the householders who are only ratepayers. But this, though the preponderating, is only one of several elements in our modern democracy. To the working men must be added that class which socially takes precedence of all others, and which is aristocratic and plutocratic in about equal degrees: the numerous class of professional men; the commercial class, which will, of course,

include the employers of labour. Here, then, we have a variety which is itself a guarantee of permanence, and at the same time that there is a distinct interfusion of orders—it being very often difficult to say where one class or interest commences and another ends—there is also a unity of upward tending aspiration. Each inferior class, in other words, takes more or less of its colour, wishes, views, from the class above it, and thus the English Constitution is indeed that of a democracy, but a democracy with a distinctly aristocratic bias. Hence there is every reason to believe that we have a twofold guarantee of national stability, first that mutual association of ranks, with a tendency unswervingly felt in one direction; secondly, the docility and enthusiasm of the working classes themselves, if only they are dealt with in a suitable manner and by rulers whom they instinctively trust. All these considerations must be borne in mind if we are either to formulate or accept that employer and servant doctrine of imperial administration which has just been spoken of. It is essential not to be misled by false analogies, but to remember that as is the servant—the governing class—so in the long run will be the governed.

But in proportion as this statement is recognised as true it is necessary to insist on the fact that a certain line of treatment must be pursued by those in whom the administration of affairs is vested. If our constitution be really democratic, yet not devoid of the leaven of aristocracy of which we have already spoken, it is clear that our statesmen must not only

mould their policy according to the exigencies of the case, but must attempt its execution in such a way as to conciliate the approval and to enlist the support of the multitude, to whom in the last resort the appeal lies. The methods which were perfectly applicable to the conduct of national affairs before the Reform Bills of 1832 and 1867, when government was, as has been seen in the preceding chapter, a stately game played by the patrician powers of the United Kingdom, are impossible now. The people have entered into partnership with the aristocracy, and they must be treated as partners. It is perfectly possible that in specific departments of statesmanship—foreign policy for instance—the new régime may involve great difficulties. Our statesmen having to reckon with a force which exists as it exists in England in no other country of Europe, may find themselves at an obvious disadvantage in the hour of international crisis, as compared with the chancellors of the Russian or the German Empires. But it argues a very imperfect knowledge of the English character to suppose that, if, at anxious moments like these, the supreme direction of affairs is in the hands of men who have the confidence of the masses—men of whom Lord Palmerston has been the most conspicuous type during the past fifty years—the democracy will claim to act upon that employer and servant doctrine in which so much of peril has been discerned. There is surely more of permanent—less of mere frothy and evanescent—enthusiasm, which the statesman may regard as the most precious of all

political capital, in the English people than among any other nation of the world. But it is only placed at the disposal of those who deal openly and fairly with the people, and whom, in return, the people delight to trust. Has this mode of dealing with the masses in these grave matters ever been fairly tried and failed? The democracy may be as mischievous an impediment in the way of a great foreign policy as it has been taunted with being, if approached in a spirit of selfish timidity, temporising vacillation, or mistimed reticence. Indignation meetings are held, demonstrations are organised, agitations are set on foot, the chiefs of the Government complain that they are paralysed by a factious opposition. But may, they not be in some degree responsible for this opposition? Is it not possible that they may in the first instance have been wanting in the resolution—fearful to hazard the compactness of their majority—to tell the people what is the expenditure and what the military measures indispensable in *their* opinion, to uphold the dignity and strength of the empire? Is it unreasonable to suppose that the Minister representing to the English people the qualities identified with Palmerston, who should rise in his place in Parliament and say that such-and-such taxation was necessary to ensure a minimum of naval and military efficiency, would find no reluctance to supply him with the funds; or that the minister who should insist upon the danger of prematurely disclosing confidential negotiations would not fail to carry his point? The real peril

would seem to come not so much from the fact that the democracy is in the last instance master of the position, as from the chance that this fact may not be sufficiently recognised.

The very working of the English Constitution is in itself a powerful force for the education and the discipline of the masses. For practical purposes this Constitution must, as Mr. Bagehot has well pointed out, be divided not into the three estates of the realm, not into judicial, executive, or legislative departments, but into two portions, the dignified part, at the head of which is the Queen, and the efficient part, at the head of which is the Prime Minister. The sovereign, says Mr. Bagehot, is the fountain of honour, but the Treasury is the source of business. Inasmuch, however, as the Prime Minister's tenure of office depends on his majority in the House of Commons, it is clear that the representatives of the people, and in the last resort the constituencies who elect them, are supreme in that portion of the Constitution to which has been applied the epithet efficient. The Cabinet is thus a committee for the administration of the empire, whose members have for the time being the confidence of that popular assembly, which itself is the mirror and embodiment of the popular will. Hence there is an interchange of influence between the House of Commons and the multitude outside, which is its creator. As the speeches made in the House reflect national opinion, so do the debates which take place in that House educate the national mind. Conscious of their power to control

the action of the Cabinet, and to regenerate the elective legislature, the constituencies often read, and sometimes digest, the speeches made at Westminster, and reported for their benefit in the morning newspapers. There is thus no divorce between the active current of a people's life and the political life of its legislators under a Cabinet system of government, the Cabinet being dependent on the popular Chamber. Under the presidential system the conditions are exactly reversed, and "a nation has, except at the electing moment, no influence: it has not the ballot box before it; its virtue is gone, and it must wait till its instant of despotism again returns. It is not invited to form an opinion like a nation under a Cabinet government; nor is it instructed like such a nation. There are, doubtless, debates in the legislature, but they are prologues without a play. There is nothing of a catastrophe about them, you cannot turn out the government." \*

While thus in one sense it may be said that as a result of its structure the English Constitution is more democratic, inasmuch as it gives the masses more direct power over the action of the legislature, than that of the American Republic, the conditions of this structure also ensure a steady and continuous exercise of influences, which, if they are not aristocratic, are at least anti-democratic, upon the multitude. At the present time the composition of the House of Commons is more dissimilar, perhaps, than it ever was before from the House of Lords. It is plutocratic rather than aristocratic,

\* "The English Constitution," p. 21.

but the tendency in England is for plutocracy to assume more and more of an aristocratic complexion. Add to this that the House of Lords is being perpetually recruited from men whose presence is the most distinctive feature in the House of Commons, men of lowly origin who have acquired position and money by their exertions and talents, by success in commerce and trade, and enough will have been said to show that however marked the contrast between the two Chambers, there will from the necessities of the case always be a gradual approximation. It is the more necessary to bear this in mind, because, as we have already seen, the political opinion of the working classes is becoming more and more organised, and we may at any moment expect to witness an accentuation of the differences that exist between the personality and the prerogative of the two Houses, or between certain sections of the members of those Houses. We must never forget that the force of repulsion is accompanied by a compensating force of attraction, and that while the working men and artisans are intent upon securing direct representation for their interests at Westminster, these representatives, when they have been returned to Parliament, will come within the circle of influences more or less the reverse of popular. It is this fusion of influences and classes, go where we may, in social life or political, in the marketplace or the assembly, in the club or at the dinner-table, which is the guarantee of our political stability and our security against revolutionary changes. We have, in a word, what would be the most democratic



Constitution in the world, were the democracy itself practically to assert its sovereign power, working in the most aristocratic manner.

Lastly, we come to the consideration of the relations in which the Crown stands towards the multitude on the one hand, and the executive indirectly nominated by the multitude on the other. According to the letter of the English Constitution, the Crown and the executive are convertible terms. According to the theory of the Constitution, the Sovereign can exercise of his or her own accord a variety of powers, any one of which would precipitate a revolution. When, in 1871, the Queen abolished purchase in the army by an act of prerogative (after the Lords had rejected the Bill) there was great and general astonishment. "But," says Mr. Bagehot, "this is nothing to what the Queen can do by law without consulting Parliament. Not to mention other things, she could disband the army (by law she cannot engage more than a certain number of men, but she is not obliged to engage any men); she could dismiss all the officers, from the general commanding-in-chief downwards; she could dismiss all the sailors too; she could sell off all our ships of war and all our naval stores; she could make a peace by the sacrifice of Cornwall, and begin a war for the conquest of Brittany. She could make every citizen in the United Kingdom, male and female, a peer; she could make every parish in the United Kingdom a university; she could dismiss most of the civil servants;

she could pardon all offenders. In a word, the Queen could, by prerogative, upset all the action of civil government within the Government; could disgrace the nation by a bad war or peace; and could, by disbanding our forces, whether land or sea, leave us defenceless against foreign nations."

If we contrast with the theoretical powers of the Sovereign those actually exercised in the relations between the monarch and the monarch's ministers, the facts may be put in a very few words. It is for the Sovereign to know the policy which ministers may be executing or deliberating, and to exercise, if she so desires, the right of encouraging, counselling, warning. The choice of its ministers is the privilege of the Crown, but this choice can only be exercised within certain narrow limits. Practically, the constituencies decide who the Premier shall be, and the Premier selects his colleagues in accordance with the political exigencies of the time. But though the Sovereign does not possess, or does not actively exercise, the power of direct political initiative, she has immense political influence, and is charged with grave political duties. Here, again, we have another illustration of the remark that, where there is knowledge there will be power. The Sovereign whose mind is a storehouse of political history and precedents necessarily affects, and frequently in a very important degree, the action of successive generations of ministers. Moreover, the Sovereign is the head not only of the Government, but of the society of the realm.

The English Court is still the greatest social institution in Great Britain; the arts of the courtier are up to this day diligently studied and assiduously practised. In a community dominated, as the English community is, by the aristocratic principle, it is inevitable that the Sovereign should always have much power. A constitutional hereditary monarchy may sometimes be compared to the presidency of a republic, but in reality it is endowed with attributes generically distinct. So long as society and politics act and react on each other, the authority of the Sovereign will never become a fiction or a dead letter.

But independently of the official duties of the Sovereign, and the political power of which, as a consequence of her exalted station, she is the depository, the Crown is the symbol of a national unity, the force of which is deeply felt by the masses. Monarchy is a strong government in proportion as it is an intelligible government. It is not an abstraction, it is a concrete embodiment of power. When the English multitude gazes upon its Sovereign it is conscious that it beholds an august personification of the principle of its rule. This is not the only way in which the existing English Constitution appeals vividly to the imagination. "A family on the throne," writes Mr. Bagehot, "is an interesting idea also. It brings down the fruits of sovereignty to the level of petty life. . . . To state the matter shortly. Royalty is a government in which

the attention of the nation is concentrated on one person doing interesting actions. A republic is a Government on which that attention is divided between many who are all doing uninteresting actions. Accordingly, so long as the human heart is strong and the human reason weak, royalty will be strong because it appeals to diffused feelings, and republics weak because they appeal to the understanding." These are the main practical elements in the strength of the English monarchy. It is a great political and a great social force, because it accords with the genius of the English people and the feelings of human nature itself.

## CHAPTER XXI.

### OFFICIAL ENGLAND.

The Great Offices of State—Their External Aspect—Their Internal Management—History of an Official Paper—The Colonial Office—The India Office—The Foreign Office—Board of Trade—The Treasury—Privy Council Office—Business done at Privy Council—The Cabinet—Mutual Relations of Cabinet Ministers—Cabinet Procedure—General View of Life of Minister of State—Non-official Correspondence received by Members of the Government.

No more ambitious pile of buildings has been added to the capital of the British Empire than that which meets the gaze of the spectator as he walks down Whitehall. On the right-hand side, as he goes in the direction of the Houses of Parliament, he will see successively the offices of the Treasury and the Privy Council Office, an old building with a new and imposing façade, and an extensive block of stately structures, which comprises under one roof the Home, Colonial, Foreign, and India Offices. By the side of these, the official residences of the Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer, in Downing Street, present but a mean appearance. Even Downing Street itself—that historic thoroughfare which has represented the great prize in a long series of political struggles—threatens to disappear, and it is probable that before another fifty years have elapsed, not one of those houses which, less than a century ago, sufficed for the conduct of nearly the entire business of the State, will be left standing. By that time we shall probably

have a material addition made to the group of edifices in which the offices above named are domiciled, designed upon a scale not less magnificent, and concentrated, without break or interruption, within one and the same august precinct.

What, it may be asked, is the nature of the business transacted within these buildings, and what its routine? What are the stages of administration which may be successively observed in the different departments of the structure? how is the influence of the outer world made known in the official penetralia? and how are the decrees fashioned which, emanating from an area of at most a few acres, are transmitted to every quarter of an empire which is a synonym for civilisation? In endeavouring to give an answer to these questions it may be remarked at the outset that there is one type of management to which the administration of the different great offices of State generally conforms. That it is more closely adhered to in some departments than in others necessarily follows from the kind of business transacted in each. In giving priority to the Colonial Office and the conduct of its affairs we are guided by a wish to present the reader with what may be called a pattern of the way in which, in an office divided into several distinct sections, the business of the nation is done. No department is so suitable for an illustration as this, because within it is transacted every sort of official and administrative business. Independently of the specially difficult relations between the mother country and its dependencies, those

dependencies have to be advised or directed on all subjects—foreign affairs, international and domestic law, finance, public works—in short, the whole duty of government.

Let it be supposed, then, that the despatches and official letters, both from England and other parts of the world, are pouring in during the hours of the early morning. It is at the Registry Office that these documents first come within the official horizon. Here there are assistant clerks who mechanically open all the contents of the letter and despatch bags, which are obviously of a more or less official character. It is not their business to make themselves accurately acquainted with their contents. They are expected to do nothing more than to gain just such a general idea of their purport and character as will enable them to get a title for the official docket of the correspondence. To this correspondence is attached, by the Registry Office clerks, a large paper for the writing of minutes, on which the day of receipt is inscribed. The second stage in the history of our official paper is its transit from the Registry Office to the head of one of the departments into which the entire organisation is divided; these departments, in the case of the Colonial Office, being, with the single exception of that which deals with general business, arranged on geographical principles. Having, then, been duly entered in the Registry book, the despatch or correspondence is forwarded to the principal clerk at the head of the department to which it immediately refers. This official examines it with a view of seeing,

in the first instance, whether it is of an urgent nature, demanding precedence over other business, and whether it requires for its proper comprehension any reference to previous transactions. In the latter case he at once places it in the hands of one of his juniors, with instructions to collect, and, if necessary, make a *précis* of, the correspondence containing the history of those negotiations, or if the task is one of particular nicety, and calls for the exercise of special knowledge of precedents, the departmental principal may probably take it in hand himself.

Thus furnished with all supplementary matter necessary for a right understanding of the case in each of its bearings, the document advances a step nearer to the ken of the great man who presides over the working of the whole office. It comes, as minuted and prepared in the department, before one of the Assistant Under-Secretaries, each of whom has assigned to him a special sphere of work, and who, after having carefully perused the papers now submitted, writes his own comments and views in the shape of another minute, and sends the whole budget, which, ever since its introduction to the office, has been gradually growing in bulk, to the Permanent Under-Secretary of State. It is to be noticed that it is at this stage—namely, when the correspondence first comes within the secretarial purview—that the element of official discretion begins. If it is perfectly plain that no decision has to be taken upon the papers, and that the course of action is simple, as, for instance,



to refer, or transmit to another department of State, then it may be conjectured that the room of the Assistant Under-Secretary will be the limit of the official progress of the paper. For the most part, however, there is no summary arrest before the Permanent Under-Secretary is reached. It is, indeed, the constitutional theory that all communications addressed to a Secretary of State on questions of the public service are laid before the Sovereign—in other words, to adapt the tradition to the ways and language of responsible government, are personally considered by the Secretary of State—and it may be said, with perfect confidence, that whenever any portion of this miscellaneous correspondence is found to involve anything more than mechanical action in accordance with previously decided principles, it comes under the eye of the Secretary of State. When, on the other hand, the point to which the correspondence relates is practically settled by well-established precedents, and there can be no doubt as to the decision, the Under-Secretary may fairly assume the duties of an ultimate court of jurisdiction. Possibly we should not be far wrong if we were to say that this contingency is realised in about half the number of cases that come forward.

There is yet one further experience which it will acquire before our typical communication from the other side of the world reaches the audience chamber of the Queen's direct representative—it has to pass into the hands of the Parliamentary Under-Secretary. It

should be understood, however, that this is not a necessary incident in the life of such an official document as we are now considering. Supposing that the business is pressing, and that the Parliamentary Under-Secretary is otherwise engaged, the paper would pass direct from the Permanent Under-Secretary to the political chief of the department, and, in fact, in all offices of State these two functionaries are the pivots upon which the whole system of administration turns; in all offices the Parliamentary and the Permanent Under-Secretaries have co-ordinate power. Their relation is thus one of mutual supplement, and while it is the business of the parliamentary deputy of the Secretary of State, who is for the most part in the House of Commons, to attend to the progress of measures which concern the department in Parliament, it is especially the function of the Permanent Under-Secretary to supply his chief with the facts and precedents which form the data on which his opinion is based. In other words, the Permanent Under-Secretary of State has to know and the Secretary of State himself has to decide.

Coming now to the work of the eminent politician or statesman who is the apex of the entire official system of a great department, let us see what are the duties which it rests with him to discharge, and how he discharges them. Supposing he is in London, two or three despatch boxes closely packed with official documents are delivered at his house, as soon as the office has closed for the evening. At any hour except meal times he may be found closeted in his study with

these. Selecting first those papers which are marked as "demanding urgency," and proceeding to the examination of the different sheets of the manuscript "minutes" or observations attached to them, he finds that they are charged with great diversity of opinion. Between these conflicting views he has to decide, and as his decision is, such will be the tenor of the despatch which is ultimately based upon it; and, indeed, it is probable that at each successive stage something like the rough draft of an answer has been drawn up by the different officials to whom the papers have one after another been submitted. Consequently, the reply finally approved of is often nothing more than a fine specimen of official mosaic. The Secretary of State, it may be assumed, in the majority of cases, adopts the form of answer which has been suggested by the Under-Secretary, with certain modifications, as the latter also, with modifications, may have adopted that of his immediate subordinate.

By twelve o'clock, the chief of the department, seated probably in his library, has gone through this portion of his work; he then returns all the documents which he has examined to his private secretary at his office. The papers are then sent back through the same succession of hands as that through which they have previously passed, and thus ultimately the reply is drafted. The entire process occupies less time than from this description might be supposed. The different stages here traced may, in ordinary matters, be performed in a couple of days, and in very few

occupy more than a week. When the Secretary of State is in the country there is, of course, a little less promptitude. Bags containing official documents are sent to him daily, the hour of their actual despatch from the headquarters at Whitehall being late, as the post there does not close until 7 p.m., when the colonial mails are sent off.

Much the same routine that has been described in the case of the Colonial Office is observed in the department which deals with the affairs of our Indian Empire. The correspondence which makes its way hither may be classed under two heads: first, that relating to the Government of India itself; secondly, the communications that originate in England, and that pass either between the India Office and other departments of State, such as the Foreign Office, the Colonial Office, the Board of Trade, and the War Office, or between the India Office and private individuals interested in Indian affairs. Again, the Indian correspondence itself is of two kinds: first, the ordinary despatches which come, in every case, either from the Government of India, or the Government of Madras and Bombay, the Lieutenant-Governors not corresponding directly with the Home Government; secondly, the secret despatches which pass directly between the Government of India and the Secretary of State. As at the Colonial Office so also at the India Office, there is a central register to which, as a rule, despatches go. There are, however, many important exceptions, and documents relating to politics or finance would go, in the first instance, not to the register,

but to that department with which they are immediately concerned, political, secret, financial, public works, military, as the case may be. They are of course opened by the secretaries of the department to which they belong, and these officials put forward the papers whenever they like. After this they pass successively through the hands of the Under-Secretary—permanent or parliamentary, according to the nature of the communication—the Secretary of State, a committee of the Council especially told off to consider documents of the class to which this one belongs, and finally, the Council itself in full conclave assembled. But the powers of the Council are deliberative, and it may be added obstructive, as well as executive. The power of obstruction is not necessarily mischievous. It is often exercised, and is intended to be exercised, as a check on rash and ill-considered action.

In the Foreign Office a very different mode of procedure is rendered necessary. A majority of the documents received here are of a more or less confidential character, and, as a consequence, the opening of the contents of the despatch bags is not delegated to subordinate employés, but is performed by some high official. Who this official may be varies according to circumstances—the deciding circumstances mainly being the view the Secretary of State takes of the limit of his responsibilities, an arrangement that may be arrived at between the Secretary and Under-Secretary, or the personal appetite for work which either may possess. Thus at one time

we are told of a Permanent Under-Secretary of State, who takes a pride in remaining at the office daily till 8 p.m., in order that he may depart with the consciousness of having broken the seals of two hundred envelopes. At another time report tells us of a Secretary of State who would allow no letter or communication of any kind to be opened by any one save himself; and who insisted on dictating answers to all the correspondence which poured in. Hence, too, it may be correctly inferred that there is not at the Foreign Office anything like the same system of minuting correspondence that exists elsewhere. The entire department is divided into what was formerly called the Establishment, but what has been rechristened the Diplomatic Establishment, and departments not on the Establishment. The new name is intended to distinguish the Diplomatic Establishment from the Librarian's Department, the Treaty Department, and the Chief Clerk's. In the Diplomatic Establishment, where a total of forty-one clerks are employed, the Chief Clerk has a department of his own, with twenty clerks under him, who are not themselves on the Diplomatic Establishment, and whose work is mainly of a financial character. Next—still on the Diplomatic Establishment—there is the Consular Department, presided over by the Superintendent of the Consular and Slave-trade Department, and subdivided into two sections: the first charged with all correspondence and other matters relating to the slave-trade, the second having to do with the Consular

Service correspondence. Lastly, there is the Commercial Department. The more purely diplomatic portion of the Foreign Office is subdivided into five departments, which are distributed geographically, and which are under the control of a senior clerk. Naturally the business transacted in all of these is of a strictly confidential character, and includes everything that appertains to the negotiation of treaties.

We now come to the Treaty Department, which is not on the Diplomatic Establishment, and which is occupied with the formal drafting and engrossing of documents which have already come under the scrutiny of the confidential officers of that august bureau. The Treaty Department is a Black Letter Department, and those who are employed in it bear much the same relation to the diplomatic staff as the lawyer's clerk who engrosses the deed to the lawyer who is the confidential adviser. Even the head of this department, though personal merit, and the technical experience which he may have acquired, often cause him to be the depository of a large amount of confidence, is not, in virtue of his office, admitted into the secrets of the Diplomatic Establishment. The relative positions of the two cannot be better illustrated than by saying that, whereas members of the Diplomatic Establishment are, *ex officio*, admitted members of the St. James's Club, members of the Treaty Department have to submit to the ordinary ballot. Of course, clerks

of the Treaty Department of the Foreign Office are trusted not to divulge the tenor of the papers which they are employed to copy and reduce to official order; but their functions are not confidential in the same way as those of the clerks in the Diplomatic Establishment. It is only when treaties are ripe for parchments, or when precedents and historical data are required in the composition of treaties, that the offices of this department are invoked, and the simple circumstance that it is the sole department in which hired writers are engaged is sufficient proof that its sphere is generically different from that of the Diplomatic Establishment.

While the Privy Council Office may be spoken of as the formal head and mother of departments, the foremost place in the official hierarchy may, on some accounts, be claimed by the Treasury. It is the Treasury which has the power of the purse over all other departments, and with which, as a consequence, the ultimate decision rests. The Treasury, moreover, in addition to being the establishment where the annual Budget is made up, has immediately subject to it the two great Revenue Departments—the Customs and the Inland Revenue—as well as the Post Office, which is only accidentally a source of revenue, while the Treasury is practically supreme in point of power. The Privy Council Office is unquestionably sovereign in respect of dignity. It may, in effect, be regarded as a species of commission for the exercise of certain prerogatives that are essentially part of



the power of the Crown. The work done by the Board of Trade and the Judicial Committee is delegated to them by and from the Privy Council, while, till quite recently, the business of the Education Department was transacted by a committee of the Privy Council, and even now its head-quarters are still under the same roof. The Board of Trade remains nominally under the direction of a committee of the Privy Council, composed of a President, with certain ex-officio members, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the First Lord of the Treasury, the chief Secretaries of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and others. But as a matter of fact, the office is entirely departmental, and when the Board of Trade is spoken of, it means for all practical purposes, not the committee of the Privy Council subject to which it exercises its power; but the President supplemented by his secretaries and official staff. Thus both in fact and in name, it is a distinct branch of the Government.

The duties of the Board of Trade Office are both multifarious and interesting. Railways, the mercantile marine of the country, weights and measures, the duty of collecting all those statistics which concern, not merely the Home Government, but the administration of imperial affairs, belong to the Board of Trade. Much of the departmental work of the office involves a knowledge on the part of those by whom it is done of science and law. Thus it comes frequently within the province of this department to decide on

the best form of railway brakes, on the structure of ships, and of lighthouses, to say nothing of the exceedingly complicated question of signalling by sea. Again, as it is our maritime power which brings us into contact at the greatest number of points with the laws of other countries, and as the Board of Trade is very largely charged with the supervision of our maritime affairs, so does it follow that various questions of international law are perpetually presenting themselves for settlement at this department. The Board of Trade may be said to take charge of a ship from the cradle to the grave. It keeps a record of all new ships, it can trace the voyages of them, and has a list of the passengers and crew whom they have upon any occasion carried. Hence the offices of the Board of Trade witness much that is touching, and contain the record of much that is noble. It is here that those who are interested in the lives of sailors go to hear something, if they can, of the fate of ships which are supposed to have been lost at sea. Here, too, is it that the claim is made for having preserved life at sea. Nor are the duties of the office in reference to railways less considerable. When a new railway is opened, the Board of Trade sends down an inspector to see that everything is in a proper state for the commencement of traffic.

The Privy Council Office may be spoken of as that department of State in which the prerogatives of the Crown are brought into immediate contact with

the persons of its ministers. It is the office which forms a common meeting ground for much of the business of other public departments. It constitutes, in fact, a kind of imperial clearing-house. Whatever can be the subject of an Order in Council naturally comes to the Privy Council Office, and is there put into a shape in which it may be conveniently considered by the Sovereign, when the next meeting of the Privy Council is held. Orders in Council relate to such subjects as the ratification of measures passed by the colonial Parliaments, royal proclamations, documents concerning the assemblage, prorogation, and dissolution of the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. Other Orders in Council are forms which give effect to treaties, which extend the terms of patents, which grant charters of incorporation to boroughs and to companies, proclaim ports and fairs, decide causes in appeal, create ecclesiastical districts, grant exemptions from the law of mortmain. There is thus an immense deal of clerkly business to be transacted in the Privy Council Office.

Her Majesty presides at about a dozen meetings of the Council in the course of the year. On the day before the meeting, all the papers to be discussed are sent to the Queen, and if she finds anything which she does not exactly understand, she will desire the attendance of the minister to whose department it relates. No Privy Councillor attends the Council meeting unless he has been specially summoned to do so. The business is naturally routine

work, and is generally despatched in less than an hour. The presence of three councillors constitutes a quorum, and the chair is always taken by the Sovereign. Again, the Privy Council is, since every Cabinet minister must first be sworn in a Privy Councillor—the theory being that the Cabinet is an inner council of the Privy Council—a connecting-link between Parliament and the Crown. The Cabinet represents the declared will of the constituencies, and the chief of the Cabinet, the Prime Minister, is the embodiment of the Cabinet in the sight of the Crown. In its relation to the Sovereign the Cabinet is an indivisible and absolute unity, nor can a Premier be guilty of an act more reprehensible in itself and in its tendency than when he informs the Sovereign of the specific causes of difficulty which he may encounter with his colleagues. “The Premier,” writes Mr. Gladstone, in “*Kin Beyond Sea*,” “reports to the Sovereign the proceedings of the Cabinet, has many audiences of the august occupant of the throne,” but “is bound in these reports and audiences not to undermine the position of any of his colleagues in the royal favour. If he departs in any degree from strict adherence to these rules, and uses his great opportunities to increase his own influence, and pursue aims not shared by his colleagues, then, unless he is prepared to advise them, he not only departs from rule, but commits an act of treachery and baseness. As the Cabinet stands between the Sovereign and the Parliament and is bound to be loyal to both, so he (the Premier) stands

between his colleagues and the Sovereign and is bound to be loyal to both."

The relations between the Secretary of State, as the head of a department, and the Sovereign, as supreme over the State itself, are illustrated by the form with which, until early in this century, this minister commenced his answer to all correspondence brought before him, namely, "I have it in command from the Sovereign to acquaint you, &c." This mode of expression has now been dropped. None the less are the relations maintained between such offices as the India Office, the Colonial Office, the Foreign Office, and the Sovereign of the most direct and intimate character. In the case of each of these departments, not merely is there the frequent, or the occasional, despatch of official papers to Her Majesty, but it is part of the recognised duties of the Secretary of State to keep Her Majesty duly informed of the general tenor and drift of his administration, and of any important transactions between the office in London and the dependency or state in some other quarter of the world. These memoranda are never written by any member of a department except the minister at its head. There is a stereotyped style in which they all begin, to this effect—"The Marquis of — presents his humble duty to Your Majesty." Two obviously proper rules are observed in these momentous communications, and in all documents submitted to the Sovereign—one is that they shall contain no erasure, the second, that the paper on which they are written shall not be folded.

Considering that the drafts of important despatches are sent to the Sovereign before they leave the office of the Secretary of State, and that, in addition to this, Her Majesty receives daily the above-mentioned reports of all matters of great importance pending, it may be readily understood that the time of royalty is tolerably well occupied.

No authentic account of the manner in which the ministers of the Crown transact their business in Cabinet has ever yet been given to the world, and the secret has been as religiously and successfully preserved as that of Freemasonry. It may, however, be reasonably conjectured that the mode in which business is conducted is conversational and easy; it is probable that divisions formally taken are exceedingly rare, that, as a rule, ministers speak sitting, and that there is a general understanding between them as to the amount of business which shall be taken on a particular day, and with respect to the limit of time which is not to be exceeded. The actual work of legislation is prefaced by two or three natural preliminary processes. Supposing that the Cabinet has come to the conclusion that a particular subject is ripe for legislation, the first step taken in the direction of legislation would be for the minister within whose department it came to draw up the heads of a Bill on the subject. Copies of this memorandum would be sent round to each of the ministers in one of the circulating boxes opened by a key in the possession of each member of the Cabinet, who, having taken a copy of the document from

that receptacle, would draw a line through his name, inscribed on a slip of paper projecting from under the lid of the box. The heads of the proposed measure would be discussed at the next meeting of the Cabinet, and the decision arrived at might probably be that a Bill on the subject should be drafted in due form; the same process would then be gone through again in the matter of the draft measure, and thus, after having been first discussed and then re-discussed, it would ultimately come before Parliament.

The life of a State official, be he Cabinet minister or State Secretary, is one of incessant strain, endless anxiety, continuous toil. Scant leisure, holidays marred by the perpetual irruptions of despatches, telegrams, and other documents, are all that the parliamentary vacation brings. While Parliament is sitting, that is, during nearly six months of the year, he is condemned systematically to burn the candle at both ends. Happy is he if he be fairly asleep by two a.m.; by noon he will be at his office in Whitehall, Downing Street, or Pall Mall, busy with the reports of his private secretaries, his letters, and much amorphous material which, if the fates be propitious, will some day or other be reduced to order in blue books, or perhaps be embodied in some measure introduced to Parliament, and, it may be, specially commended in the speech from the throne. The chances are that our Secretary, or Under-Secretary, has been already up since eight or nine, after barely five hours' feverish sleep. He has been, in all probability, as a sequel to a hasty and unsubstantial

breakfast, endeavouring to brace himself for the toils of the day with a canter in Rotten Row. But just as that equestrian promenade begins to grow populous and gay with many riders and loungers, our official, consulting his watch, or admonished by the chimes of Big Ben, turns his horse's head, and makes his way towards Westminster.

Let those who sometimes complain of the inaccessibility of the gentlemen responsible for Her Majesty's Government reflect how closely packed are the occupations of the official days, how short the time for the performance of innumerable tasks. There is a deputation to be received which will absorb at least an hour; there is the daily conference between the Secretary of State and the Under-Secretary; there are business interviews with other members of the Government. In addition to this, there is the preparation for the night's work in Parliament. Notice has been given of questions, and the materials for reply have to be diligently searched out. A debate is expected, which will draw special attention to the department, and the honourable or right honourable gentleman who represents it must, by dint of much official cramming, furnish himself with all the facts and figures requisite for a complete exposition of the case. A Bill which the Government is bent on "carrying," and which is being opposed at every clause, is making its way through committee, and our statesman, to whom it is chiefly entrusted, must prove himself an encyclopædia of practical arguments, each one of which is a conclusive refutation of



censure and criticism. Four o'clock comes, and the minister has to be in the House. Who shall blame him if he has economised to the utmost the four preceding hours, or who would remove the mysterious inaccessibility with which he endeavours to hedge himself round?

Apart from the papers which come before him in the conduct of the regular business of his department, a Minister of State is burdened with an immense variety of general correspondence. There are letters from the chiefs of the Opposition forces, proposing some plan for the conduct of a debate; or suggesting some compromise on a particular Bill which may happen to be in committee; or showing how, if the right honourable gentleman would but adopt such-and-such a course, he might disarm some of his most formidable critics, and count at the same time upon satisfying all his more reasonable and moderate partisans. Happily, the strife of the "ins" and the "outs" is conducted with an amenity in England unknown elsewhere, and this portion of the ministerial correspondence conclusively proves the fact. Indeed, our imaginary First Lord, or typical Secretary of State, very often finds that the communications of his professed friends are more troublesome than those of his professed foes. A follower who is an inveterate crotcheteer is a more awkward customer than a factious antagonist. As the statesman to whom it has pleased Her Majesty to give her confidence looks at his letters, there are certain handwritings which he contemplates with

profound weariness. He recognises at a glance the envelopes which he knows contain absolutely impracticable hints and recommendations, utterly groundless protests, and quite impossible requests from his most loyal, but most importunate supporters. That little sheaf of letters which he puts on one side is a collection of communications, the respective authors of which express a hope that the right honourable gentleman will so arrange that they shall have a day for introducing a Bill much desired by themselves or their constituents; or deferentially point out that if a ministerial measure be marked by the presence or the absence of a certain clause, some great industry will be menaced, or some powerful interest injured; or assure the minister that it will be highly desirable if, for the purpose of reassuring the more weak-kneed of his followers, he will take an early opportunity of declaring what points or principles of it are indispensable. What does the minister do? Some he answers in a few lines at once; others he puts aside for consideration—all have his attention. He will consult his department on some; on some he will communicate with the whip of the party, the patronage secretary of the Treasury as he is officially called, and will ascertain from that functionary whether the discontent to which such letters point can be said to contain any of the elements of danger.

Putting aside the mass of correspondence which the minister receives from his brother members

of the elective House, we may glance at some of the most salient characteristics of that countless multitude of epistles, written by members of the extra-parliamentary public, which daily discharges itself into Downing Street. Many there are of precisely the same character as might be found on the breakfast-table of any private or non-official senator: applications from friends and constituents for berths in Government offices; letters particularly drawing attention to the neglect of local welfare by the Imperial Parliament; appeals to charity, and expostulations, varying in tone from the cringing entreaty to the peremptory demand on the subject of projected legislation, which will be seriously detrimental to the commerce of particular boroughs, or the traditional rights of counties; letters applying for additional salaries from officers who are in the employment of the Government, and who are often a greater source of trouble to an administration than difficult colleagues, or importunately burning questions. A Cabinet minister is, of course, assailed with applications from old personal friends, on behalf of their sons, or other members of their family, for whom they wish to secure nominations to offices in the Civil Service. There are, also, lengthy communications from the accredited agents of the party in the provinces, despatched, in the first instance, to the head whip, and by that officer laid before his chief. Some of these are troublesome enough. The minister hears that the great tin-tack interest is united as one man against the measure which the Government has

introduced for regulating afresh that particular industry; or that an agitation, which may become formidable, is being organised for the remission of the present imposts on velveteens and smock frocks. Others are written with reference to a vacancy, actual or impending, in a parliamentary seat, which has been hitherto occupied by a supporter of the administration, or which it is hoped to wrest from the Opposition. These are documents which require the closest attention of the ministerial mind. Composed with great skill and local knowledge, they place before the official eye precisely the qualifications which are required in the forthcoming candidate. If no person has already paramount and irresistible claims to represent the party, then comes the exercise of the official choice. The local agent waits with anxiety to know what the selection is. The gentleman on whom the lot has fallen may be a perfect stranger to him, or known only by distant rumour. But as soon as the aspirant member for the borough has set foot within the town, and has been closeted with one or two of its leading inhabitants, so soon does that astute agent know whether the politician despatched by the "party" is or is not the right man for the right place.

Even as the Imperial Parliament sitting at Westminster, is, in a manner, a national High Court of Grievances, so is every Cabinet minister stationed at his desk in his office the daily recipient of epistles complaining of wrongs inflicted and injustices sustained, either by an accidental mishap in the machine

of government, or by the operation of some law, vicious in principle and mistaken in practice. The number of letters of this character varies in the different departments of State. Possibly the most ponderous pile of all is that which is deposited within handy reach of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for War. Are not the Services chartered and inveterate grumblers? But what shall be said of the countless wails, pitched in every key of discontent, from that of the supplicating and expectant widow to that of the veteran who has grown bald and bronzed in his country's service under a tropical sky, which that other right honourable gentleman or nobleman, the Secretary of State for our Oriental Empire, is condemned to receive? Sometimes these documents contain the threats of an action at law; sometimes they are piteous protests against the rate of exchange, and the depreciation of the rupee; sometimes they are entreaties from a mother, whose husband has died a hero's death, that a berth of some sort may be found for her son. The outside communications chiefly received by the head of the Colonial Office are of a different character. Colonists being their own masters, and carrying with them wherever they go the representative institutions of the mother-country, have for the most part no troubles for which they seek redress at the capital of the empire. Yet they are not uncommunicative, and sometimes their communicativeness lapses into importunate garrulity. They have much information to give, and they give it freely without being solicited,

on the character and wants of the various parts of the colonial dominions. Much more often than might be supposed, the correspondents of the Colonial Secretary suggest fresh annexations of territory; there are even cases in which unemployed gentlemen, their hearts burning for adventure, apply for a charter for a filibustering expedition, whose object it is that the British standard may float over realms now held by the noble savage, while applications for concessions from companies and individuals are of course exceedingly common.

Let our inquiries once more range into a very august sphere. We are in the sanctum of the First Lord of the Treasury, the Prime Minister for the time being, whatever the personality of that individual. The great man looks, with as much of a smile as his features can wear, over a sheet of post letter-paper, written in a large clear hand, or listens while his secretary tells him something of the contents of an epistle much interlined and underscored. What is the purport of the document? Let it be understood, that all the eccentric letter-writers of the United Kingdom seem to select Downing Street as the point at which to discharge their missives. That the head of Her Majesty's Government should receive applications from some two or three gentlemen a week, who are anxious to edit his speeches, with possibly a brief introductory memoir; that he should be assailed by mysterious correspondents, who assure him that they have intelligence of the most vital moment to the realm,

which they would communicate to him personally since they fear to entrust it to paper; that he should be pestered by prayers for small places from obscure partisans and ecclesiastical preferment for hungry divines; that a considerable portion of the contents of his letter-bag should be the impudent petitions of pure mendicity—in all these cases the statesman shares the common lot of exceptional eminence.

Of all Her Majesty's principal ministers of State, none are so much solicited by requests to receive deputations, and by general correspondence of an indescribably miscellaneous character, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of the Home Department. Among those letters are some of the most useful and suggestive received in Downing Street. The departments and legislation of which these two ministers have charge render it desirable and necessary that they should have the minutest acquaintance with special demands and local requirements. A comparatively trivial alteration in the incidence of a tax may make all the difference between the imposition and the removal of a burden of discontent. Is it a licensing bill on which the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department is engaged? Of course, the most exhaustive investigation which official machinery can command, into the wants and wishes of the people has been made before the measure was drafted. But the official eye is sure to neglect something. There are certain facts, certain exceptional conditions prevailing in particular districts,

which have somehow been ignored. These are formally communicated to the department which takes cognisance of them, are duly inquired into, and very frequently have the effect of considerably modifying the ministerial measure. On the other hand, neither at the Home Office nor the Treasury are the letters of impracticable crotcheteers and pragmatic hobbyists unknown. If preposterous proposals and impossible plans could have contributed to such a result, an efficient alternative to capital punishment would long since have been discovered—nay, crime itself would have probably become extinct in this realm; while as for the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he would have paid off the National Debt five times over.

That which forms the most romantic portion of the ministerial letter-bag has still to be noticed. Diplomacy, as it is conventionally represented to us, is a darkly mysterious science; and not a few of the letters which find their way to the head-quarters of British diplomacy are of a corresponding character. If the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs were to believe all that his correspondents tell him, we should have had him living for a quarter of a century past on the brink of a volcano, whose eruption would have long since desolated the kingdom with the burning torrents of revolution let loose by foreign hands. But self-seeking adventurers and applicants for employment are among the most copious contributors to the Foreign Office letter-bag. Not merely at a time of European



unrest, but in the midst of profound peace, there are scores and hundreds of ladies, as well as gentlemen, who profess themselves ready and able to reveal the clandestine designs of foreign governments, and to act as secret agents generally, for a modest honorarium. There is a conspiracy brewing in some obscure portion of the world which must, sooner or later, assume disastrous dimensions, and of which only the particular applicant can, by proceeding to the spot, at the charge of the public, give accurate intelligence; or it is highly desirable that the Government should send, *sub rosa*, the writer on a mission to Bithynia; or their correspondent, A., B., or C., has had experience and possesses linguistic attainments which would make him invaluable in the employment of the Crown. Lastly, the diplomatic service is aristocratic, and the Foreign Office is fashionable; and, as to the fashionable and aristocratic suitors for places and nominations who approach the Foreign Secretary with every kind of letter, is not their name legion?

## CHAPTER XXII.

### THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Prevalence of Parliamentary Ambition—Sensibly mitigated by Counter Attraction of Literature, Journalism, &c.—The Value of a Seat in Parliament—The Work which it entails—Inconveniences attending it—General Relations between M.P.'s and Constituents—Small and large Constituencies—The House of Commons the "Manufactory of Statute Law"—On the Eve of a Great Debate—Characteristic Scenes in Passages and Lobbies—Scene in the House itself—Presentations of Petitions—How Notices of Motion are given—Balloting for Days—General Description of House—General Aspect of Members—Questions answered—Business begins—Preliminary and Personal—The Debate itself—The Orator—The Dinner Hour—Hostilities renewed—The Whip—The Division—Prevailing Excitement—The Prose of Legislation—Progress of a Bill from Introduction to Royal Assent—Qualities shown by Honourable Members in Committee—The Speaker: Functions and Position—Some Rules and Practices of the House—Motions—The House of Commons' Clerks—Select Committees—House of Commons Oratory—Is it declining?—Excellencies of House of Commons—Tastes of House and *Nuances*.

EVERY Englishman, Mr. John Morley has remarked in his work on "Compromise," is either actually or potentially a parliamentary candidate, and the political instinct is certainly still vigorous in the British breast. Whether, however, the desire on the part of English citizens to win a seat in the House of Commons is or is not on the decline, whether the House of Commons itself may not be suffering from other competing opportunities of political activity, are questions on which more than one opinion may be held. Five-and-twenty years ago a political career in England was necessarily a parliamentary career. If

a man wished systematically to influence contemporary opinion on public affairs, he at once directed all his efforts to getting into the House of Commons. The pamphlet had already lost its power, political journalism was an imperfectly developed force, and the aspiring statesman, eager to address himself to the world, could only do so through the medium of the morning newspaper, which reported his speech. The position has now been materially modified. There are not only more political journals and more political writers; the writers in these journals are taken from a class to which they never before belonged. Journalism may not have yet completely lost, to the sense of the more fastidious, all disreputable associations, but the reproach against it is gradually dying out, and the stigma becoming fainter. The journalist has long since left his garret in Grub Street; he is not necessarily educated for his vocation in squalor and poverty; he is the friend of influential personages, and is very possibly, quite apart from his pen, an influential personage himself. Then, if at the present day the pamphlet is an anachronism, some half-dozen collections of a dozen pamphlets each appear every month. The old quarterlies of party have been succeeded by the new monthly periodicals of culture. The review, instead of being the organ of a section, is a platform for the individual. To contest constituency after constituency is disagreeable and costly work. After many struggles success may not be attainable; and even when the House has been secured, political eminence and influence do not always

follow. There are the whims and tempers of our six hundred kings to be studied; there is the risk of the hell of failure to be run. It is much easier, much less expensive, much more satisfactory, to serve in the army of paper politicians.

Some notoriety and a small measure of capacity will secure for the aspirant to literature a place in one of the influential monthly organs of select opinion, in whose pages he may find himself elbowing a former Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer, jostling against a group of lay and clerical disputants, or sitting next to an illustrious doctor of physical philosophy. If the attention paid by some honourable gentlemen, when they address the House of Commons, to the reporters' gallery can be described as the homage of oratory to literature, the spectacle of well-known statesmen fighting grave political issues in the monthly magazines suggests and symbolises the triumph of the pen over Parliament. It is impossible to doubt that the multiplied opportunities which are placed at the disposal of the thoughtful statesman by editors and publishers must have the effect of preventing many gentlemen who might otherwise be moved to do so from issuing their addresses at the forthcoming general election. The paper politicians, as we have called them, are a growing and a respectable class; the periodical invented for their wants gives them all the publicity they could desire, or they can at least afford to postpone entering the House of Commons till they have educated that assemblage up to their own professorial level.

But there are other and more generally cogent reasons which will probably tend to diminish the number of possible candidates for the House of Commons. The number of persons who think they have a political mission is strictly limited, and many gentlemen who go into, or who are ambitious of going into, the House of Commons are animated by two motives—desire of social promotion, or of extended personal power. Now it is beginning to be very questionable whether the degree and kind of social promotion which a seat in Parliament brings with it are sufficient to compensate its possessor for the expenditure and worry which it entails. No senator and no senator's family were ever advanced to the rank of social sovereignty by the magic influence of the letters M.P. The social aspirant who goes into the House of Commons very soon finds that the social accessories of St. Stephen's are to a great extent an illusion. He may receive more invitations, and when he is being entertained by certain hosts may have the gratification of knowing that he secures greater attention ; but he seldom succeeds in entirely changing his social level. His social position, in fact, is not so much exalted as emphasised. What holds good of the elective legislator himself is yet more strictly applicable to his family. If his wife and daughters were not in the way before of meeting peers, diplomatists, attachés, young men of birth and fashion and wealth, neither will they be in the way of meeting them now ; if, on the other hand, they were, they will find their previous opportunities multiplied.

But the personal importance and the professional or commercial value of a seat in the House of Commons are unquestionable. To these must be added the essentially interesting nature of the occupation. The House of Commons is at once a mirror and a concentration of the national life. There is no rumour of any sort, social, commercial, diplomatic, or political, which does not make its way into the lobby of the House, though it may not indeed reach the ears of all who throng that octagonal chamber. "Before the House," writes Mr. Palgrave,\* "passes yearly every national anxiety. Whatever occupies the attention of this great empire makes its appearance there, be the subject trivial or important, be it the state of Rotten Row or the conduct of a war. A parliamentary discussion also is sure to turn a subject inside out, and to disclose its precise nature. To hear this well done is no sorry amusement; intellectually it is a great gain. Moreover, the gossip of the House is of first-rate quality. To tell or to hear some new thing it is the best place possible, nor are the new things repeated in Parliament only gossip. ~~Passing~~ events do not merely furnish talk to the House; they are a part of the history of our land." Here, then, we have a list of attractions sufficiently numerous to account for the popularity of the House of Commons, and to justify a certain limited acceptance of Mr. Morley's rather sweeping dictum. Hence it is that there is no lack of candidates to spend upon a parliamentary election

\* "The House of Commons," by Reginald F. D. Palgrave, p. 48.

an amount of money and trouble which, if placed in a sound commercial enterprise, would give the investor a competence for life. For these reasons are the abnormal hours and the severe labours which constituencies demand, tolerated with equanimity for six months of the year. A member of Parliament who is desirous of doing his duty will often commence work a little before noon, only to leave off two or three hours after midnight. At twelve o'clock, he will take his place in a committee-room, and sit there with a few interruptions till four. Then he is due at the House, and there he remains till long after the chimes announce that a new day has begun. In the sessions of 1860 and 1877 the Commons worked after twelve o'clock at night during more than a hundred and fifty hours. This represents the addition of fifteen working days of ten hours each to the session. Add to this that before a member of Parliament can have learned the nature of his business, he must have mastered the contents of Sir Erskine May's "Parliamentary Practice"—about 800 pages in length and full of figures and facts—that if he wishes not to let the business of the session fall hopelessly into arrears, he must make the acquaintance of a pile of papers and blue books, of whose bulk some idea may be formed from the fact that they average an annual total of eighty volumes; that there are also constantly coming before the House great commercial enterprises, affecting large private and public interests, such as the supply of water to towns, and the making of railways; bear all this in mind, and it will

be seen that during the session a member of Parliament who does his duty can have but little time which he may call his own.

Besides his purely parliamentary labours, there are those which his private relations with his constituents involve. No mistress was ever more intolerably jealous and exacting of her lover than the ordinary constituency of its representative. The member of Parliament is never certain for six months or six weeks together of the loyal affection of his electors. The last time he was amongst them they received him with the most cordial and effusive of welcomes. Since then he has had letters from, or interviews in the lobby with, some of the more influential of his supporters, from which he gathers that he has contrived to offend a sensitive but important section; he has forgotten that his borough is a place in which urban and county interests meet, and farmers and tradesmen both accuse him of having been indifferent to matters that are of vital import to them. He has trimmed upon the Burials' Bill. It seems very much as if he had ratted upon the County Suffrage; or he has not taken sufficient notice of the mayor of the town when that local potentate came up to London a few months ago.

On the other hand, the legislator who has won the confidence and affection of a smaller constituency is not required to pledge himself to the support of any very definite programme or any specific nostrums, as is the representative of an important borough, fully



conscious of its own merits and power. So long as he generally attends to the local interests and business of the borough he will be allowed to do pretty much what he likes; but he must take care that he does not become a mere political abstraction to his electors. He may do what he will with his principles, but though his constituency are devotedly attached to the small borough-member, even their fidelity is not proof against all temptation. If he leaves them alone too much he knows that he will have but himself to blame if things go wrong. And it is no laughing matter, in the thick of the session and the season, to be called upon once a fortnight to travel a hundred and fifty miles to preside at a dinner of townsmen, or to take the chair at the annual jubilee of a friendly society.

But it is time that some idea should be given of the manner in which the business of the nation is transacted in the House of Commons. It is yet too early for the visitor to enter the chamber of the popular legislature, seeing that prayers, said daily at four o'clock by the chaplain, are not yet over. They are three in number, one for the Queen, another for the royal family, a third for the Commons, on behalf of whom it is supplicated that their deliberations may be conducted "without prejudice, favour, or partial affection." Then comes the collect beginning "Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings," and in less than ten minutes everything will be ready for the evening's work. If there is an important debate imminent, all the seats in the body of the House will have been occupied while the short

religious service is in progress, for it is only by being present then that an honourable member can take his place and establish a right to occupy it throughout the evening. Before prayers, he may symbolise his appropriation of a seat by depositing in it his hat and gloves, or perhaps a bundle of papers; but it is only when prayers are over that he is permitted to place his card in the little brass frame let into the back of the bench, and thus secure the seat for himself during the whole evening. The chaplain now leaves the chamber, walking backwards and bowing all the way. The Speaker takes the chair, and at the extremity of the table opposite him, the mace, which symbolises his presence, is deposited by the Serjeant-at-Arms.

Meanwhile, there is a busy scene to be witnessed, not merely in the House itself, but in those parts of the building which lead to it. The appearance of the Westminster lobbies may generally be taken as an accurate index of the character of the debate, impending or in actual progress, and the merest tyro may infer, from the composition of the crowds that throng the passages, whether it is Bible, or beer, or Irish affairs, which engage the attention of Her Majesty's "Faithful Commons" on any given evening or afternoon. If the first, he will see in the Great Hall the passages and the ante-chambers populous with thronging groups of enthusiastic clergymen. If he made his way into the members' lobby, he would have seen the lay bishops of the House of Commons the centre of a demonstrative group of clerics. The

scene on the occasion of any Bill which touches the licensing laws is equally typical. Perspiring publicans are seated at intervals along the line of approach to the senatorial sanctum. Some of these gentlemen are chiefly anxious to gain an order for admittance; the majority are intent on more serious business. On another occasion it is neither the public-house question, nor the Church question, which invites the attention of an elective legislature. We are to have an Irish evening, and the nationality of the imminent discussion is immediately shown in the composition of the knots of gentlemen standing in and about the members' lobby. Every variety of Hibernian accent is audible, from the thin, nipping brogue of Dublin, to the rich broad roll of Cork. Some of these sons of the Emerald Isle are the correspondents of Irish newspapers, waiting, it may be, for any intelligence which they can pick up, or perhaps to receive from one of their compatriots who is going to enlighten the House that evening with his oratory, a full and correct report of the as yet undelivered speech. Others are possessed by a spirit of feverish anxiety to know whether certain petitions have been presented.

In the actual lobby of the House may be seen our elective legislators, in little knots of three and four, discussing with each other, or with friends and constituents, the events and the rumours of the hour; newspaper editors, who have the entrée of the place, button-holing some great man with a view of learning State secrets, and very frequently some occupant of the

reporters' gallery, who is also a correspondent of a provincial journal, engaged in much the same process. The doors of the House are constantly swinging backwards and forwards. White-haired janitors guard the portal on either side; the air is full of the buzz of conversation, and all is motion and life. The spectacle visible inside the House itself is not one of less animation. Each successive foot of the green leather-covered benches is being occupied by gentlemen who have already left there the emblem of rightful possession, and who stream in one by one, and two by two, while private business is going on. This is the name given to all measures promoted by railway companies, gas companies, water companies, municipal corporations, or private individuals. Everything that passes with reference to these Bills in the House of Commons is, with scarcely an exception, purely formal. The private Bill, after having been read a first and second time, the reading simply consisting of a motion that it shall be so read, is referred to a select committee, who pass the measure, send it back to the Commons for the third reading, and thence to the Lords. Not much attention is therefore paid to the earlier proceedings of the parliamentary sitting. At half-past four o'clock, the public business, which is the real business of the evening, begins. The House of Commons is a great national court of grievance, and to these grievances its attention is drawn by petitions. On each side of the table hang carpet-bags in which the document in question is dropped. As a rule the presentation of a

petition resolves itself into the inscription of its subject and its origin on two pieces of paper, which are sent to the reporters' gallery. A member of Parliament, however, has the right to declare, *vivâ voce*, who the petitioners are, and what their aim is. Further, he may insist that the whole document shall be read aloud, but not audibly, by one of the clerks of the table. The next stage in the proceedings is the giving notices of motions. These notices may relate either to questions, or resolutions, or Bills. As regards the first, notice of question is generally given by the member to the Minister, and this is for the most part done by the interrogant writing his question on a piece of paper, and handing it to the clerk at the table. As there are always many more honourable members anxious to obtain a day for their motions than there are days available, it is necessary to resort to the process of deciding by ballot how these days shall be allotted. On the table of the House there lies a notice paper with a row of printed figures at the side; on this list members write their names. In a box before the clerk at the table are small bits of paper twisted up, bearing figures which correspond to those on the sheet. When, therefore, notices of motions are called, the clerk draws one of these pieces from the box and reads aloud its number, while the Speaker looking at the list in his hands, calls successively by name the gentleman whose patronymic is written opposite the lucky figure that comes out. Hence it is a mere question of chance whether a private member obtains an opportunity for bringing

forward a motion or not. There are only two days, Tuesday and Friday, in the week available for this purpose. Monday and Thursday are Government nights. On Wednesday, which like Tuesday and Friday is open to the private member, but for bills only, not motions, the discussion on any subject closes at a quarter to six.

Before the actual business of the evening commences, the appearance and the occupants of the House may be briefly described. We are now entering, let the reader suppose, through the door which opens immediately out of the lobby. Above us is the clock, and on either side, raised a little above the level of the floor, are rows of seats allotted to the secretaries of Ministers and other privileged persons. As the visitor looks straight in front of him—he is now advancing to that invisible line which runs from the capacious chair in which the Serjeant-at-Arms is ensconced to the seat opposite, which is called the bar, and at which all persons, printers, writers, and others guilty of contumacy are summoned for breach of privilege—he will see rows of benches, covered with green leather, rising tier on tier on either side, while immediately opposite is the Speaker's chair, on a small elevated dais. Immediately beneath the Speaker are the three clerks at the table, who wear, in virtue of their office, independently of whether they are or are not barristers, wigs and gowns. The benches on the Speaker's right hand are occupied by the Ministers and their

supporters, those on the left by the Opposition—the members of the late Government being seated on the front Opposition bench, as the members of the present are on the front bench confronting them. This row of seats is divided by a small interspace to admit of the passage to and fro of members, which is known as the gangway, and below the gangway sit the independent English members, and below them, as well as intermingled with them, the Irish Home Rule members. Once more facing about, so as to be exactly opposite Mr. Speaker, we elevate our eyes and see in the gallery, beneath which enter those members who wish to attract little notice, and which rises immediately above Mr. Speaker's throne, the representatives of the press, seated in two rows. Those who occupy the front boxes are the actual reporters, busy with their stenographic symbols; those seated behind them are either reporters waiting their turn, or leader-writers for the different newspapers listening to the debate. If you cast your eye still farther up, in the direction of the roof, you will perceive an iron grating in the wall, whence there look out the faces of ladies. This, indeed, is the ladies' gallery, better known as the cage, and though many proposals have been made to do away with the railing which obscures their view, the step has always been resisted on the ground that it would tend to distract the attention of honourable members from parliamentary business.

Now, let the reader suppose that he has ascended

to that gallery in which are congregated the gentlemen of the press. He is on a level with the two galleries in which members of Parliament sit and watch the debates. Opposite him, and still on the same level, are a succession of galleries which require explanation. The first of these, that which directly overlooks the area of the House, is devoted to peers and ambassadors, and other illustrious personages. Just behind this there are seats which the scholars of Westminster School are allowed to occupy, and to which members of Parliament may sometimes introduce upon special occasions the more distinguished of their friends. Behind this is the Speaker's gallery—two long rows of seats, closely packed, one may be sure, if a debate of any importance is expected; and behind this, again, is the strangers' gallery. Behind this there is a small compartment, fenced off by an iron railing—another ladies' cage—the Serjeant's gallery, the gallery of the Speaker's wife, for ladies, being the right hand compartment of the cage looking towards the Speaker's gallery.

Already it is possible to form some notion of the personal appearance of the honourable members of whom the House consists. They enter one after another, in all kinds of costumes, and with every sort of manner. The first thing which it is natural to remark is that the operation of the ballot has caused but little change in the exterior aspect of the members of the House of Commons. The parliamentary visitor will see sitting on either side of the Speaker's chair the same



array of broad-acred squires and of successful merchants as he has observed any time during the last ten years. The squires are not quite so numerous as they were. The barristers are more numerous. There are not, perhaps, quite as many young men as formerly. In the House of Commons elected in 1874 there were only a hundred members under forty years of age, of which one-half were less than thirty-five, while only sixteen were less than thirty. Of the former of these—those less than thirty-five—twenty were sons of peers, whose election was mainly attributable to family influence. Among the Home Rulers, the proportion of young men was unusually large.

Yet more significant is it that of the House of which we are now speaking more than one-fifth of the total members should have been elected during its existence, and that even thus the average age should be more than fifty. There are indeed men in the House of Commons who take to politics as a profession. They are the salt of the assemblage, and they alone will ultimately rise to the highest political distinction. But then these have abundant means of their own, and the fact remains that for the greater number the House of Commons is the glorified haven of men who have been successful in other pursuits. Not merely has the extension of the suffrage increased the polling-booths and the costlier parts of the electoral machinery, but in the life-time of each Parliament members find themselves involuntarily compelled to spend more money in local charities and other institutions, in the hope, if possible,

of averting a contest. Again, even in the larger constituencies where most of the expenses are paid by subscribers there exists a distrust of youth, and the preference is given to the middle-aged gentlemen, especially if they happen to have been in the House of Commons before. The most costly seats of all are probably those for the metropolitan counties, in the case of which the object is to get a candidate who is a personage both in the city and in his suburban neighbourhood, or who is willing to pay for the possession or the continuation of distinction which a seat for a metropolitan county confers.

The truth is that we see everywhere in politics what we have seen in society, the general substitution of the plutocratic principle for the aristocratic, although, as has been already pointed out, it is a plutocracy round which there have crystallised themselves many of the prejudices and sentiments of aristocracy. Since the repeal of the Corn Laws the peerage has been increased by more than eighty new creations. Yet in the House of Commons elected in 1874 there were not represented more than two-thirds of those peers who were represented in 1846. Here then is the evidence of the great change which has been accomplished. Whereas twenty years after the Reform Bill of 1832, there was scarcely any diminution in the total of peers' heirs in the Lower House, the diminution is now an accomplished fact. The conclusion is therefore irresistible that the tendency will be more and more for titles without money to be regarded as politically useless.

The notices having been despatched, the time for the asking and answering of questions arrives. Most of these, it may be supposed, have neither urgency nor interest, but there are some, from the replies given to which it would seem that an idea of the ministerial policy on matters of pressing moment may be formed. When we come to these, the murmur of talk is changed for comparative silence. The only sounds audible in succession are the voice of Mr. Speaker, who summons the questioner, of the questioner himself, of his ministerial respondent, of the crackling of paper as the gentlemen of the House of Commons turn over the leaves of the orders of the day, and of the deadened monotonous of suppressed chatter in the distance. Supposing the answer to be one which clearly shows that her Majesty's Ministers have, or have not, decided to adopt a certain line of action in a matter of supreme national moment, there is sure to be a great demonstration of feeling. Very frequently, however, these interrogations relate to imaginary grievances and unfounded reports. There are many different ways of answering such—the circumlocutory, the evasive, the enigmatical, the humorous, the contemptuous, the solemn, the jocular, the courteous, the sarcastic. The questions over, the next thing is to pass to the order of the day. Let it be supposed that this order—the day being a Thursday, and consequently appropriated to ministers—is, that the House shall resolve itself into Committee of Supply, to which it is possible that an amendment

has been proposed directly or indirectly raising the question of confidence in the Government. Now it is perfectly possible that before the gentleman who, having a night or two previously moved the adjournment of the House, has the right to open the debate, has commenced to speak, another honourable member may rise from his seat with an intimation that he wishes to bring before the Speaker, to whom every member does as a matter of form address himself, a question of order or privilege. This generally portends that some purely personal episode is imminent. An honourable gentleman whose sentences are capitally constructed, and whose voice is clear and bitter, protests that he has been gratuitously vilified by an honourable member outside or inside the House, and wishes to draw attention to the fact. After he has done, the incriminated senator explains what he said, why he said it, and what he meant. Then comes a wrangle of tongues, and sundry signs of tumult; first one member and then another bobs up his head, demanding silence and order. Tempers are becoming heated and patience exhausted. A politician, who has an unpleasantly plain way of putting matters, suggests that the real problem is whether A did or did not mean to insinuate that B ought to have his place in an unmentionable category of baseness. This brings things to a head, there are explanations, verbal refinements, compromises, and so without anything being really retracted or definitely denied, the matter drops, and, ruffled and agitated by the preliminary

skirmish, the House addresses itself to the business of the night.

Calm and self-possessed in the midst of a storm of cheers, mingled, it may be, with a few derisive sounds, the orator of the evening rises to his feet; his voice is low, his manner admirably collected. Before commencing his speech, he takes care to see that everything he may want in the course of its delivery, books of reference, sundry documents, and a tumbler of water, are within easy distance. All this he does as tranquilly as if he were about to sit down in the solitude of his study for a hard morning's work with his pen. Nothing can be more considerate than his opening language, nothing more reasonable or cogent than his earlier propositions. Presently something of a change comes over the spirit of his utterances. He has heard some side remark, he has been irritated by some ironical cheer, or by some aggressive "no, no." In a moment the speaker is transformed, the quiet and measured tones are exchanged for a vehement flow of rhetoric; protest follows protest, each clothed in language of new vigour, and illustration is piled upon illustration. The display, which all admit is magnificent, comes to an end at last, and after the motion has been duly seconded by a political friend there rises to answer from the ministerial bench a middle-aged gentleman of rather sleepy manner, but who gradually works himself into a state of artificial energy. In a statement which makes little pretence to rhetorical merit, and which from beginning to end is severely business-like, he

endeavours to show that the statesman who opened the debate is wrong in his facts, and untrustworthy in his conclusions. The speech of this gentleman, who is a minister of State, possibly the leader of the House—though, as a rule, it is upon the leader of the House that the duty falls of replying on the whole discussion towards the small hours of the morning—occupies, perhaps, rather more than an hour. It is now close upon half-past seven, and honourable members commence to leave the House, intent upon dinner. Yet though the benches are almost deserted, the tide of speech still rolls on. After a space of about eighty minutes, the House gradually recovers from its condition of emptiness and langour. A brisk interchange of fire commences along the whole line of the two political armies. The sharpshooters stand forth, and in more or less animated harangues of twenty minutes endeavour to spread confusion among the ranks of their opponents, and the rest of the evening is occupied with a series of duels in the conduct of which the chief of the two sets of combatants exercise their authority and give counsel.

All this time there have been busily moving in and out, never sitting down, and never absent from the House for many minutes together, four or five gentlemen, whose chief business it seems to come in, look around, consult a piece of paper in their hands, make a memorandum, whisper a few words into the ear of an honourable member, and then disappear, only to re-appear and again to do precisely the same thing.

These are the whips, three of whom are officials, while the other two act for the Opposition. It is the function of the whip to see that the members of his party are on the spot when a division is imminent, and that the debate is conducted according to the lines laid down. But he has other work than this to do. He must be imperturbable in his temper, unerring in his tact. If he can win a vote he must accept any number of snubs, and honourable members generally are very fond of snubbing whips. He must observe everything, and appear to observe nothing. He must be omniscient without being inquisitive. He will carry to the Prime Minister a faithful and particular report of all that he sees and hears, and the Prime Minister from that information will judge what he can and cannot achieve, and will regulate his policy accordingly. The Prime Minister may regard a Bill as the embodiment of a political principle; the whip looks at everything not in the light of a principle, but as a question.

The mere machinery by which a Treasury whip brings his men to the House is simple enough. At six p.m., he knows that an important division will be taken next day. He communicates with the individual who acts as a kind of clerk to the Patronage Secretary of the Treasury, and who, be the Ministry Whig or Tory, preserves to each in turn on its accession to power a profound silence as to the tactics of its predecessor. This gentleman, on receiving his instructions, repairs to his office in King Street, the lithograph

## THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

machines are set to work, and before the arrival of the post next morning the doubly, or trebly, or quadruply underscored notes are delivered with the parliamentary notices to honourable members. Having issued the whip, the great thing for the whip himself is to see that members do not slip through his fingers. Hence he may have to scour the clubs, as well as to guard religiously the portals of the Senate. Further, while the model whip must be vigilant as Cerberus and as active as an acrobat, he must be careful not to seem the despot that he really is. He must be absolutely incorruptible, and that in the midst of transactions which have a flavour of jobbery about them. There are a number of small pieces of patronage in the hands of the Treasury of some £80 or £100 a year, and it is the business of the Treasury whip, as Patronage Secretary, to discover how these may be most advantageously disposed of. He must exercise the same judgment in deciding who and what are the proper objects of assistance from the private funds of the party; an individual, it may be, in the costly struggle of a contested election, or possibly a newspaper in the depths of chronic impecuniosity. Nor must the Treasury whip merely pay studious heed to the convenience and even the caprice of the ministerial flock. It is necessary that he should cultivate the good opinion of his opponents, and it is especially necessary that he should be in the confidence of the gentleman who, as his personal rival on the Opposition benches, is the candidate for the post which he himself holds.



## ENGLAND.

But let us suppose that the hostilities are now practically concluded, and that the final issue is about to be decided. The Speaker has for the last time put the question. The cry, "Division! 'vision! 'vision!" has been rung out by the doorkeepers and police. The division bells have been set ringing from one end of the vast building to the other. Scouts have been despatched in swift hansoms to the clubs to collect laggards and deserters, and diners and smokers at the St. Stephen's Club, hard by, have been startled by the sudden sound of the electric alarum. They have mustered at last, and a closely-packed phalanx has been collected under the Peers' gallery. The final order is given—ayes to the right, and noes to the left. Slowly and quietly do they file out into the respective lobbies. The doorkeepers come in, see that no honourable member is left behind, peer under the benches and lock the doors. In the course of two or three minutes they begin to defile on their return journey through the re-opened portals. At last, in the space perhaps of a quarter of an hour, the House is completely re-filled. The four tellers, bowing at every step, march up to the Speaker's table, and the result is known. The Government have a majority of nearly two to one. It is an hour past midnight, an hour at which some latitude is to be expected and allowed. The spirit of the schoolboy lives in the breast of many a middle-aged M.P. Leaps are made from the floors to the benches, huzzas are heard. No one knows what representative government is, till he

has beheld, on an exciting issue, a division in the House of Commons.

But it is not to be supposed that the House always transacts its business at this point of high-pressure, and if we wish to see what are its more normal condition and atmosphere we must visit it upon a less stirring occasion. The House of Commons is the manufactory of statute law, and its first business is to legislate. It will, therefore, be not amiss briefly to glance at the various stages in the progress of a Bill through Parliament, from the moment of its introduction till it receives the royal assent. It has many vicissitudes to encounter, and many risks to run. First comes the oral statement of the purport of the measure—technically known as the request for leave to introduce it—made by its promoter, who afterwards appears at the bar of the House and is summoned by the Speaker. Then follows the first reading; and though the measure might be opposed at this period, it is seldom, or never, that such opposition is forthcoming. The real contest begins when, probably in about three weeks from this date, the motion is made that the Bill shall be read a second time. The debate which arises on the second reading of any measure submitted to Parliament centres round the principle of the proposed legislation, and if that legislation is not vetoed then, the project, though it may be materially modified in committee, is not likely to be ultimately rejected. Let it then be assumed that a parliamentary Bill has passed the

stage of its second reading—and if the measure is of great importance, the debate which will have attended this consummation will have been full of interest and excitement—and that the motion before the House at the present moment is that the assembled members resolve themselves into committee, or, as the Speaker puts it, that “I do now leave this chair.” Here the opposition which was possible on, and even before, the first reading of the measure, and which was very likely actively forthcoming on the second reading, may be renewed. Another long debate may ensue, amendments may be proposed which deny the expediency of any legislation at all, or insist that if legislation be forthcoming it shall assume a different shape. The babel of tongues is once more heard, and the familiar scene of rhetorical controversy is repeated. At last the motion is carried, and the House of Commons has affirmed by a majority—though, of course, there need not have been any division on the subject at all—the proposal to go into committee, and to replace the Speaker for the time being by the Chairman of Ways and Means. There is little visible difference except the substitution of the latter for the former officer of the House between the Commons in committee and in ordinary debate. The step taken is an historical survival of the old days of the Tudor and the Stuart despotism. “The exclusion of the king’s emissary and spy—their Speaker—was the sole motive why the Commons elected to convert themselves into a conclave

called a committee, that they might meet together as usual, but without his presence.”\*

Every clause of the measure now before the House is gone through, amendments are forthcoming, are accepted by the Government or by the authors of the Bill, or are rejected and divided on, as the case may be. Sometimes it happens that an amendment is passed in committee and is carried, which affects a vital point in the measure, and materially alters its character. In this case the member who is specially charged with the interests of the Bill will perhaps rise and propose to report progress—in other words, that the House shall resume—so that he may have an opportunity of consulting with his colleagues. Nothing can exceed the thoroughness, and occasionally the pertinacity, exhibited in committee of the whole House. Sometimes there are set speeches made, which were perhaps intended to be delivered on the occasion of the second reading of the measure, but for which the opportunity could not be found. For the most part, however, the discussion is conversational, honourable members speaking not for effect, but simply with an eye to business. No student of the House of Commons on these occasions can fail to be struck by the ready amount of varied and practical knowledge which its members display. Honourable gentlemen, whose voices are seldom or never heard in the course of great debates, rise up again and again—for when the House is in committee there is no limit to the number of times which a

\* “The House of Commons,” p. 11.

member may speak—and are found to have a minute acquaintance and a grasp of the subject which were but little suspected. It may be lightly said of a particular House of Commons that it is the reverse of brilliant, but whether this reproach has or has not any truth, it may be declared with confidence that no House of Commons ever sits at Westminster which does not creditably reflect the intelligence of the nation, and whose members, if they are not heaven-born statesmen, fail to display a singularly creditable aptitude for, and insight into, public affairs.

Our imaginary parliamentary Bill is now so far advanced on the high road towards becoming a parliamentary Act, that it has emerged from committee modified, we may hope improved, but still substantially the same measure as when it was read a second time. The Speaker is once more in his chair, and the motion which he proposes to the House is, that the Bill, as amended by committee, shall be received. Here, again, the opportunity of opposition is renewed, nor is this the last chance that the more obstinate opponents of the measure may have of thwarting it. Having gone through the Commons, the Bill will be sent up to the Lords, and the Upper House will have precisely the same power of remodelling it as the Lower has enjoyed. But the people's representatives do not surrender their right of veto upon any changes which may have been insisted in the measure by the hereditary legislators. The Bill once more formally comes before them, and the

Commons are invited to pronounce upon the Lords' amendments. Granted that even this further ordeal is over, and that nothing remains but the formal bestowal of the royal consent for the measure to become law, that will be formally given upon some future day. One afternoon while petitions are being presented in the House of Commons, a rumour suddenly runs round the benches that there is a message from the Lords. In a moment the door of the House is closed, three loud knocks against it are heard, and it is known that Black Rod demands admittance. The doorkeeper, who has previously slammed the portal in the face of this august official, now opens a wicket, like that of a Freemasons' Lodge, peers out at Black Rod through it, next unlocks the door, and proclaims in a loud voice to the assembled Commons, "Message from the Lords." Then the door opens to admit a gentleman with a cocked hat in one hand, and a sceptre in the other, habited in black breeches, who walks with a bow at every step up the House, till he finds himself opposite the Speaker, the Speaker himself rising to receive him and returning the reverential salute. He then informs "this Honourable House," that the Lords desire its presence to hear the royal assent given to some Bills. After having delivered this message he retires, walking backwards from the Commons' Chamber, bowing all the way, a feat not to be accomplished without considerable practice, as well as natural skill. The next thing is for the Serjeant-at-Arms to lift the mace from the table, and to lead the way to the bar

of the Peers' Chamber, followed by the Speaker, who is the representative in his own person of the collective assemblage over which he presides. Now may be witnessed in the body of the Peers' Chamber a curious and interesting sight. On the woolsack is seated the Lord Chancellor, as the chief of the commissioners to whom the Queen has delegated that attribute which makes her supreme over the national legislature. The keeper of Her Majesty's conscience wears a triangular cocked hat on his wig, the other peers composing the commission wear those cocked hats which are best known as fore-and-aft, and are also clad in their scarlet robes. Presently there advance from the table a short clerk and a tall clerk, of whom one reads the commission, in which it is declared that the Sovereign entrusts her royal prerogative, upon the present occasion, to these her well-beloved Lords, and as each peer's name is recited, he raises his hat. Then, last of all, the formula is uttered with the traditional pronunciation which is not exactly that of Parisian French, "*La reyne le veult.*" If the measure happens to be a money Bill, the phrase used is, "*La reyne remercie ses bons sujets, accepte leurs benevolences, et ainsi le veult.*"

The Speaker cannot leave the chair of the House of Commons until the adjournment is formally moved, and there is a story told, which is perfectly true, of a distressing, or rather humorous contretemps, which once occurred towards the close of a sitting of the House. It was long past midnight, the House was

deserted, except by the Speaker himself. He, however, sat on, and seemed likely to continue to sit on, for no member had formally moved the adjournment; nor could he be released from this durance until a senator, recalled from his homeward course, had brought forward the necessary motion, in the appropriate phraseology. Mr. Speaker Denison, writes Mr. Palgrave, on this incident, was, "during those minutes of detention, doing penance for the misdeeds of his predecessors; because Speaker Finch, or Speaker Seymour, obliging their royal master, and disobeying the wish of the House, had often abruptly stopped debate, by hurriedly 'pattering down' from their chair, and away out of the chamber; practices which, centuries ago, compelled the Commons to establish as a rigid rule, that come what may, their adjournment must ever be upon a motion put from the Chair, with every consequent formality." Instead of there being any jealousy of the Speaker now as the representative and custodian of kingly power, there exists an immense respect for his office. In magnifying his authority, the Commons are indeed magnifying their own. Disrespect to him is disrespect to the House. He is the depositary of the collective dignities, rights, and privileges of members. Hence his ruling is never demurred to; and the member who did not comport himself deferentially to the Chair would be held to have sinned against the unwritten law of the House. Advised by a counsel, it is necessary that he should be an authority on matters of constitutional law, and



that he should be infallible on all matters of parliamentary procedure. In this latter task he is much assisted by the Chief Clerk at the table. He has authority over the wording of all motions, and of all questions asked or proposed to be asked by honourable members of the Government; and it is his duty to see that no debateable matter, and nothing which can be construed as directly involving an argument or an inference is imported into them.

What ordinarily takes place when the sitting of the House has come to an end is, that the Speaker rising from his chair, bows, not as might have been supposed, to the leader of the House, but to the Secretary of the Treasury, who acts as his adjutant, and who returns the obeisance. Immediately after this is audible the cry, "Who goes home?"—a relic of those times when members of Parliament used to make up parties for the homeward journey to protect themselves against the attacks of highwaymen. The police in the lobbies, however, do not echo this shout, but simply announce "House is up."

Something must be said about a few of the chief rules and practices of the House of Commons. No member of Parliament can address the House, unless there is before it a substantive motion; if, therefore, he wishes to direct its attention to some matter, personal to himself, or if he wishes generally to attack the conduct of the Government, and has had no opportunity for doing this in the course of regular debate, he puts himself in order, by rising after the questions

have been asked, and announcing that at the commencement of his remarks he will conclude with a motion. This motion is one for the adjournment of the House, and it is theoretically open to members to bring it forward whenever they think fit. But inasmuch as it involves a considerable loss of time, there is the strongest feeling against resorting to the expedient, save upon the most pressing urgency; and unless the occasion be extremely grave, or the reputation and popularity of the member moving the adjournment such that they can submit to a very considerable strain, the experiment will be made amid a storm of angry and disapproving shouts. The House almost always adjourns, if news suddenly reaches it of any very touching or terrible event. It did so when there arrived the news of the murder of President Lincoln; and much more recently, when it was announced that one of its members had just expired in the Library.

The Speaker has, among many other duties, two particular functions to discharge. In the first place, he has to see that the debate does not stray hopelessly from its original subject; in the second, that none of the laws of parliamentary courtesy or business are infringed; thirdly, it rests with him very much to arrange the plan of a debate. As regards the first, it has been illustrated recently, in a case spoken of by Mr. Palgrave, when the subject of the discussion was the silk duty. One honourable member seized the occasion of delivering an harangue denouncing the

love of money and its deteriorating effects on the national character. The Speaker then interposed, and endeavoured to guide the discussion back to its proper channel; a second diversion took place when another honourable member drew attention to the taxes imposed on corks, and the Speaker interfered again; a third time, the discussion rambled off from silk to the state of commerce generally, and once more the Speaker mildly protested. As regards the real function of the Speaker, it is comparatively seldom that he is called upon to exercise his authority. The personalities which were common in the House at the beginning of the century have almost disappeared now. As regards the third of the attributes of this functionary, the management of debates, it is one in which impartiality is absolutely essential, and which is usually exercised, in common with the whips, on both sides. The theory, of course, is that a member wishing to speak has only to catch the Speaker's eye, and to receive his nod; but, as a matter of fact, it is pretty well known and settled beforehand, whom the Speaker will contrive to see. The member of Parliament in question has either intimated directly to the Speaker his wish to take part at a particular stage in a particular debate, and has received his approval of the idea, or else, having mentioned the matter to the whip of his party, has secured for himself a place on the list of speakers, which is suggested to the occupant of the chair. Every member, when speaking, is obliged to stand with his

head uncovered, unless indeed he happens to draw attention to something connected with the division, while the division is actually in progress, in which case he speaks sitting and covered. Private members have, as has been already said, the right to bring forward their motions on those nights on which the order is Supply. Now Supply can only be granted in committee; therefore, the first thing to be done is for the Speaker to put the question, when the words Supply Committee are read by the clerk at the table, "That I now leave the chair." Upon this the member who has precedence with the motion of which he has given notice, rises up and bows. The Speaker then puts to the House, as an amendment to the question, "That I now leave the chair," the proposal to insert after the word "that" the motion to be brought forward by the particular member, instead of the words, "I now leave the chair." The Speaker continues in his place, and the motion of the private member is accepted or rejected, as the case may be. Supposing that there are other motions on the paper, and that there is time to discuss them, it is one of the rules of the House that they should not be divided on, the explanation being, that the House has already decided that the question shall be put, that the Speaker shall leave the chair, that it cannot reconsider the decision, and this being impossible, that there is no way of moving an amendment, which is the form technically assumed by every motion on Supply.

As the Speaker is the great leviathan of the House

of Commons, the incarnation and the tutelary governor of its dignities, rights, and privileges, so the Serjeant-at-Arms is the officer who guards his personal majesty—and therefore that of the House—while the clerks, at whom we glanced in our hurried bird's-eye view of the chamber, are his agents and deputies. Though there are only three clerks actually sitting at the table of the House of Commons, the staff of House of Commons' clerks includes a great many others. There are indeed no fewer than four distinct offices in the House, each furnished with a clerkly staff numbering some six or seven officials. Of these the first is the Public Bill Office, which receives and examines public Bills, is responsible for correct printing, and the insertion of all amendments; the Journal Office sees that the diary of the House of Commons is properly drawn up from the vote; and also by keeping an account of these votes acts as a check on the Treasury; the Committee Office keeps the Minutes, and sends clerks to the Committee. The record of the business of the House of Commons actually despatched is known by the *Order Book* Minutes, while the *Order Book* relates to the impending business; both are in the hands of the clerks. As regards the private Bill procedure, it is the duty of the Private Bill Office to see that these measures are in proper form, and the Speaker's counsel looks through them to see that there is no informality. In addition to the subjects already mentioned are those which come within the province of the private Bill; all questions relating to naturalisation and devolu-

tion of estate come within its scope. In addition to the Committee on Petitions, there are several other committees which meet periodically during the session. Of these the most popular and the best attended is the Committee on Kitchen and Refreshments, the only one at which members are allowed to smoke, and which meets on Wednesday afternoons when the House of Commons is sitting; though its proceedings only become of any great interest or importance when discussions of an exceptionally stormy character are expected. With the exception of this committee, which meets, as has been said, on Wednesday, these bodies generally assemble on Monday or Thursday, Tuesday or Friday. The nomination of members of Parliament to sit on these practically belongs to the under-whips on the two sides. Altogether, there will be probably sitting at the height of the session, from fifteen to twenty committees, many of them being, of course, select ones, to which Bills are referred, and whose deliberations immensely assist the progress of parliamentary business.

Canning was called by John Wilson ("Christopher North") "the last of the rhetoricians," and often, since his death, the complaint has been heard that the art of parliamentary eloquence is extinct; it has been said, "There are long speeches, sarcastic speeches, and crack speeches; but they are not such speeches as fell from the lips of Burke, Pitt, and Fox, or, more recently still, from Canning and Brougham." The truth of this remark may be frankly admitted; let us endeavour to explain the conditions which may

be held to account for the fact. In the first place, it is as unreasonable to expect the oratory of Burke and Pitt, or of Canning and Brougham, in a Parliament elected under household suffrage, as it would be to expect their policy. The policy of an administration depends upon the character of the House of Commons for the time being ; so, too, must the standard of parliamentary oratory. "The grand debate, the popular harangue," which we look for and find in the Georgian era of parliamentary eloquence, existed under a condition of things which cannot be recalled at will. Instead of the real opposition between Whig and Tory, at a time when they differed on fundamental principles, and were perpetually challenging each other on momentous issues, that struck at the root of government, we seem to have little more now than the antagonism between the ins and the outs. From the Exclusion Bill to 1714 Whigs and Tories were separated by the disputed succession of a Popish sovereign. Later on, in the days of Lord Melbourne even, there was the controversy between the country gentlemen and the commercial class—the former complaining that the corruption exercised by the latter upon the Government was fatal to the best interests of the realm. From the days of George III. to William IV. Whigs and Tories were mutually distinguished by different views of the royal prerogative. Moreover, the time was eminently calculated to inspire patriots and politicians with great thoughts, and with noble language in which to express them. The existence of England as a nation

was menaced, and even domestic policy was debated from an imperial standpoint. The situation was full of dignity and danger. Men rose to it unconsciously, and the entire atmosphere was ennobling. When the thirty tyrants at Athens wished to check the flood of Attic eloquence, they reversed the *bema* on the Pnyx, so that the speaker should no longer catch his inspiration from the prospect of the sea, the scene of the greatest Athenian triumphs. This simple historic circumstance remains for all ages the symbol of the influence which national spirit must exercise over national eloquence. Year after year the tendency asserts itself more and more with the constituencies to send to Parliament as their representatives men who are rather specialists than statesmen. The favoured candidate is he who has made a particular study of some particular branch of political or social knowledge; who is master of the whole question of local taxation; who is versed in all the mysteries of poor-law administration; who is conversant with Bank Currency and Consolidated Funds; with drains and sewers; with School Boards and the new Educational Code. And this is inevitable. The British elector, in showing himself more or less a believer in the philosophy of Mr. Gradgrind, is true to the practical spirit of this very practical age. There is little or no scope for the exercise of imagination or the display of taste in the arena of political discussion. What the House of Commons has for the most part to consider, is not so much broad questions of policy, or great problems which lie at the root of



society and government, as technical points of political economy, and dry and minute details of commercial and industrial arrangement. The machine of government has grown terribly complex; its movement is necessarily less rapid. It would be unreasonable to expect from those who regulate it, the rush and vigour of the age of Pitt and Fox.

Again, the House of Commons is necessarily, in a sense, the educational mirror of the nation, and its speakers naturally reflect the dominant intellectual influences of their day. The present age is one of educational transition. The literary, and above all, the classical lines of the past are being deserted. The expulsion of the Muses from the national curriculum is rapidly becoming an accomplished fact, and the goddess *Scientia* is being enthroned in their place. The chief cause of the richness and elegance of the general standard of debate which formerly existed in the Commons was the education which its members received. The ground-work of that education was literary; the intellectual influences, to which they were from the first subjected, was classical. Eloquence and oratory are essentially Greek and Roman arts, and our first statesmen have, without exception, learned them from the Greek and Roman models. The entire atmosphere of the House was suffused, as it were, with a classical aroma. The ablest metaphors, the happiest repartees were drawn from the classical storehouse.

But if we have seen the last of the school of literary

and classical speakers, there is no reason whatever to anticipate a decline in the debating power of the popular chamber of the legislature. There may be less of art or artifice, but there is no diminution of vigour, nor is there any slackness of appreciation on the part of the people's representatives of really good speaking. The House of Commons is always profoundly impressed by anything which strikes them, as unlaboured and natural. Hence the great success of Mr. Bright's speeches in Parliament as elsewhere; they are instinct with genuine pathos, a pathos which is dependent not merely on the wonderful simplicity of the language itself, but on the tone and manner of the speaker. On the other hand, there is nothing which the House of Commons objects to more than the assumption of infallibility on the part of any of its members. The House is in this, as in many other things, a reflection of the most strongly pronounced traits in our national character. The feelings which dominate the public school, the regiment, the college, the profession, and any other society of Englishman of whatever age, are also those which are represented in the House of Commons. Simplicity, directness, business-like despatch—all these are qualities eminently valuable in the eyes of members of Parliament. There is no reproach greater than that of exaggerated self-sufficiency to be brought against one of the representatives of the people. Just as the House dislikes above everything the man who shows that he is free from any kind of doubt or scruple upon every subject, so also does it show the sentiment of its dislike

in an unmistakeable manner. The stubborn member who will not yield to its collective will when indubitably expressed, the member who speaks with the affectation of dogmatic certainty on all subjects, the member who is under the influence of strong animosities, members who have bad tempers, or who are without the gift of concealing them, usually fail in parliamentary life. It must always be recollected that English politics are free from that acerbity which infuses the venom of bitterness into the political life of France, and that political differences do not operate as any bar to personal goodwill.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

### THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Reasons for treating the House of Lords after the House of Commons—Reasons why the Proceedings of the Peers have latterly increased in Interest and Importance—Class of Questions in which the House of Lords from its Composition is specially competent to instruct the Public—General Relations between the Two Houses—Legislative Activity of the Lords—Difficulties of Young Peers—The House of Lords in Action—Inside the House—Points of Difference from Commons—The Whips—Questions—Progress of Debate—General Conduct of Business—Questions of Possible Reforms—Future of Parliament.

IF considerations of dignity and of fidelity to the letter of the Constitution had influenced us, we should not have given priority of treatment to the House of Commons over the House of Lords. But our object is to show the British Constitution actually at work, not to analyse its component parts in a state of quiescence. The practical business of Parliament is to maintain the government and to legislate. Neither can be done apart from the House of Commons; and if that House has made up its mind on which way either the one or the other task is to be accomplished, it may be predicted with certainty that the House of Lords will eventually shape its course accordingly. But to say this is not to imply that in its own particular sphere the House of Lords is subordinated to the House of Commons. As a matter of fact, since 1874 an unusually large number of national measures have originated in the chamber of our hereditary legislators; it has been the scene of

many debates of great moment and of rare excellence ; it has witnessed the rise and development of one or two parliamentary reputations on a more striking scale than the House of Commons has known. The statesmanship, the oratory, the wisdom, and the debating power of the Peers will compare favourably with the best standard of the Commons. It was Sir Robert Peel's opinion that the statesman primarily responsible for the conduct of Her Majesty's Government could not possibly discharge all the duties of his position in the House of Commons ; and in an address which he delivered in August, 1876, at Aylesbury, Lord Beaconsfield may be said to have endorsed and emphasised this verdict of his ancient foe. Further, there is the noticeable fact that half of the Select Committee known as the Cabinet, which initiates the legislation of the country, and on whose conduct the fate of the Government and parties depend, have seats in the House of Lords. The Ministry formed in 1874 has, in fact, been extremely weak in debating resources and rhetorical capacity in the House of Commons, and abnormally strong in the House of Lords. This is exactly the reverse of the Conservative situation thirty years ago, when Lord Derby, then Lord Stanley, was summoned in the lifetime of his father to the Upper House, to reinforce and to inspire the enfeebled and dispirited Tories.

Again, the character of the debates in which the House of Lords has been principally engaged has been favourable to the display of those peculiar qualities

which secure a strong influence for the Peers over public opinion. Knowledge is power, and where knowledge is authority is sure to drift. To address the House of Lords on certain questions is to address a jury of experts. Not only is there represented in that House all the matured wisdom and ripe experience of the Commons, added to all that is most characteristic of the traditions, pride, and prejudice of the peerage: among those who take their place in the ranks of our hereditary legislators are men who have controlled important dependencies of the Empire of Great Britain, and who have acquired an insight, by long residence in foreign capitals, into the diplomatic secrets of European Cabinets, and into the hidden tendencies of the popular will—former and future ambassadors, the governors of important colonies, generals who have held the highest military commands, viceroys who have administered our Indian possessions, in comparison with which the British Isles are but as a speck in the ocean; these, to say nothing of men who have been steeped in the atmosphere of statesmanship and office from their infancy, are prominent in the Peers' assembly during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.\* Hence, seeing that in the past few years foreign policy has been a conspicuous theme in parliamentary debate, the proceedings of the House of

\* It is further to be noticed that the principal leaders of debate in the House of Commons are now—more than formerly—transferred to the House of Lords. Thus the two front benches of the House of Lords in 1879 number among their occupants the former Mr. Disraeli (Lord Beaconsfield), Mr. Gathorne Hardy (Lord Cranbrook), Sir Roundell Palmer (Lord Selborne), Mr. Bruce (Lord Aberdare), Mr. Cardwell (Lord Cardwell)—all of them formerly parliamentary leaders in the Commons.

Lords have acquired a new interest and importance. Granting that the average of rhetorical skill in both Houses is pretty nearly equal, the average of superior merit is higher in the Peers than in the Commons. Further, the speeches made in the House of Lords have not only been often better than those made in the House of Commons, they have often been better reported; first, because as a rule they are shorter; secondly, because they are, as a rule, delivered much earlier. Only on three occasions since the Reform Bill of 1832 has there been any appearance or danger of a collision between the two Houses of Parliament. The first of these was in 1860. On May 21st, the House of Lords had thrown out the Bill for the remission of the paper tax by a majority of 89. The Opposition was successfully led by the venerable Lord Lyndhurst, who, on his 81st birthday, spoke with all the eloquence and acumen which had made him famous half a century before. The question was whether the Peers had a right to reject a money Bill. It was admitted that they had no right so to amend a money Bill as to change the amount or incidence of taxation in any degree. On the other hand, it was shown by Lord Lyndhurst that the right now claimed by the Peers of rejection had been exercised before, and was logically implied in the discussion by the House of Lords of such legislation. These arguments were not replies to the contention that it was inexpedient to assert the privilege, and as is generally the case when a consideration of technical

legality arises, the controversy was ultimately decided, not by the division in the House of Lords, but on the broad grounds of constitutional policy and prudence. The matter was first relegated to a committee, and then settled by Lord Palmerston's resolutions of July 5th, 1860. It is only necessary to mention by name the two other instances in which differences between the Houses of Lords and Commons have menaced a legislative deadlock. Of these the former occurred when the Bill for the abolition of the Irish Church debate was going through Parliament in 1868, the Peers ultimately giving way. The latter took place three years later, when their lordships rejected the Bill for the abolition of army purchase. Since then, unless, indeed, it be during the first and second sessions of the Parliament elected in 1874, when the Public Worship Bill—so far as concerned the question whether the discretionary power should be vested in the bishops, or only in the archbishops—and the Appellate Jurisdiction Bill, respectively, underwent considerable modification at the instance of the Lords, there has been no hitch in the amicable relations of the two Houses. The legislative activity of the House of Lords has also been noticeable since 1874. The Public Worship Bill in 1874, and the Judicature Act in 1875, both owed their parentage to our hereditary legislators, and in the following year, the Oxford Reform Bill first saw the light in front of the woolsack, and was the occasion of one of the most noteworthy speeches of the session from the Archbishop of Canterbury.



It is to be noticed also that the recent debates in the House of Lords have not only been in many cases of a high order of excellence, but that they have introduced to public attention a larger proportion of capable candidates for political eminence comparatively, if not absolutely, than has been observed in the House of Commons elected in 1873. This is the more remarkable, seeing that the number of those who habitually take part in parliamentary debate is much smaller in the House of Lords than in the House of Commons. In the latter, the total may perhaps, roughly speaking, be fifty, in the former it is probably not more than fifteen. Further, difficult as it may be for a young and untried man to get the ear of the House of Commons, that difficulty is very much greater in the House of Lords. The young peer rises full of suppressed fire and enthusiasm, to meet with as chilling a reception as a well-bred audience can give. He is ignored; he is silenced by a general undertone of conversation; or he finds that he is defeated by the peculiar acoustic qualities of the chamber in which he essays to speak. It is a different thing if he belongs to a family traditionally famous in parliamentary annals. If he is a Duke of Richmond, a Marquis of Salisbury, an Earl of Derby, Carnarvon, or Clarendon, or the representative of any other great political house, he will be sure of attention. But at all times the sphere of active statesmanship in the House of Lords has conformed to the conditions of a close borough, and unknown aspirants to parliamentary

fame have not been encouraged, and have proclaimed their ambition only to insure collapse. That this tradition has to a great extent been broken through in the course of the past year must be partly perhaps ascribed to the circumstance that the House of Lords has signally ceased to be under the domination of one or two individuals, and thus for the present the paralysing influences which such a régime naturally exercises upon the rest of its members have passed away. Its ruling spirits, of course, assert themselves. But nothing like the dictatorship which, in times past, Lord Thurlow, Lord Eldon, the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Lyndhurst exercised, can now be found. There is undoubtedly a growing tendency among their lordships to give the rising talent of their House a chance, and this tendency has already had the happiest results.

For the purpose of acquiring a general view of the House of Lords, its chief members, and the manner in which business is conducted therein, perhaps it will be permitted to ask the reader to accompany us thither in imagination, on any afternoon during the session. It is essential that the weather should be fine, for the Peers' Chamber is dependent upon the beams of the sun for its picturesqueness of effect. It is five o'clock, and in another place—the House of Commons—work has been going on for three-quarters of an hour. Most of the gentlemen strolling through St. James's Park in the direction of Palace Yard, or dismounting from carriage and horse, there or at the entrance to St.

Stephen's from the side of Poets' Corner, are peers, and from their number it may be inferred that an interesting or important debate is expected. The House is beginning gradually to fill as the visitor takes his seat, not behind the bar, nor in front of the House—positions the best for the purposes of hearing, but the worst for purposes of vision—but in the front row of the strangers' gallery. The afternoon sun pours in through the painted windows, illuminating the gilding of the decorations and bathing in lustre the green carpet with its prince's feathers of gold, and the crimson morocco of the benches. If there is something barbaric in the hues and patterns, there is some effect of historic dignity in the statues of the famous founders of noble houses which adorn the niches in the wall, and under which are inscribed names immortalised in our national history. On each side of the chamber, save the side allotted to reporters, is the Peeresses' gallery—that structure against which Lord Redesdale so emphatically protested, on the ground that it would make the House of Lords like a casino. If gay dresses can produce this result there is certainly some danger of Lord Redesdale's apprehension being fulfilled. Given only fine weather and an attractive debate, and the Peeresses' gallery will be a *parterre* of elaborate and multi-coloured toilettes, rivalling in their resplendent variety the innumerable tints which the decorative taste of Barry has impressed upon the architecture of the fabric.

It is not only in these respects—sumptuous orna-

mentation, the presence of ladies, full in the sight of assembled legislators—that the interior of the House of Lords presents such a contrast to the House of Commons. There is an air of agreeable abandon in the mien and behaviour of their lordships. The countenances of the members of the House of Commons have for the most part, a look of anxiety or preoccupation. They enter their chamber like men oppressed with the consciousness of responsibility, burdened by a despotism of immutable laws and rigid etiquette. There is nothing of the sort in the House of Lords—no painful evidence of the thralldom of ceremonial rules or customs, or of the ruthless sacrifice of pleasure to duty. The whole atmosphere is redolent of well-bred *nonchalance* and aristocratic repose. For instance, there is in theory a Speaker of the House of Lords, called though he always is the Chancellor, just as there is a Speaker of the House of Commons; but the functions of the two are separated by a gulf which is conclusive as to the difference of their relative positions, and also as to the spirit in which the business of the two Houses is conducted. The Speaker of the House of Commons is something more than *primus inter pares*. For the time being he is regarded as of a nature different from, and superior to the honourable gentlemen by whom he is surrounded. Though there is nothing which the House of Commons likes better than a personal encounter, or a vituperative duel between any two members, there is nothing approaching to disrespect to the gentleman who is the first commoner

in England—the custodian and embodiment of its privileges—that it will tolerate. The Speaker of the House of Commons is, in fact, the Commissioner-in-Chief of the privileges and prerogatives of the House of Commons—whom the House has agreed to make the depositary of its ceremonial interests. To the Lord Chancellor no such trust has been delivered, the Peers are a self-governed body, the preservers of their own “order,” and the protectors of their own privileges. Though the keeper of the Queen’s conscience may sit enthroned in majesty on the woolsack, he is not fenced round by a divinity sufficient to deter noble lords from lounging indolently at half-length upon its well-padded sides. Save for the dignity of his garb the Chancellor might be nothing more than the usher of the court; unlike the Speaker in the House of Commons, his lordship does not decide who shall have priority. When more than one peer rises, their lordships keep order for themselves; the Chancellor has not even a casting-vote when the numbers in a division are equal, and his only strictly presidential duty is to put the question, and read the titles of measures. On the other hand, he is the direct representative of royalty on all occasions when the Sovereign communicates with Parliament, and he is the representative official mouthpiece of the House of Peers when they hold intercourse with public bodies, or individuals outside. It is rare to find more than a third of the sittings of the House of Lords occupied. There is no need for members, as in the House of

Commons, to come down a couple of hours before the business of the day begins, and bespeak a place for themselves by affixing a card.

All is calm; there is no haste, no rude competition, no unceremonious jostling. It is five minutes past five, and Lord Cairns has taken his seat upon the woolsack. The proceedings of their lordships begin with what, to the spectator from the gallery, is merely a dumb show. The Chancellor rises, repeats a cabalistic formula, which is in effect the titles of the measures that are not opposed—private Bills, and so forth—and after having murmured, in tones audible to few but himself, some twenty times, that the “contents have it,” sits down, and waits for his colleagues on the ministerial bench, or his noble opponents on the Opposition bench, to commence. Independently of the condition of the galleries, and the space before the throne and in front of the bar, behind the iron benches at the opposite end of the House, there are other signs which will acquaint the visitor whether a keen debate or important division is expected. If it is he will notice that the parliamentary clerk, who stands a little in front, and to the right of the entrance on the left side of the throne, is particularly busy in writing down on a tablet which he carries in his hands the name of every peer whom he can see. He will also notice that a gentleman of pleasant appearance and polished address is particularly active in saluting noble lords as they come into the chamber, or after they have taken their seat. Presently the same gentle-

man hurriedly commits a number of names to paper, under the heading C. and N. C., not before he has first conferred with the above-named parliamentary clerk for the purpose of verifying his catalogue, standing a little aloof, smoothing with his hand, at intervals during the process, his flowing beard. At last his task is over. He completes his calculation with a smile of satisfaction, and walks leisurely up to the Government leader in the House of Lords to whisper a few words in his ear. The Government leader is for the time the President of the Council, and his friend and colleague is the most popular and assiduous ministerial "whip" ever known in their lordship's House. Meanwhile ministers are answering the few questions to which in the House of Lords they are ever called upon to respond. The curious feature in the collective life of the House of Lords at the present moment is that no one seems to care for what his neighbour is doing or saying. The Chancellor is writing a note on his knee. The Primate is talking to an archdeacon whom he has introduced into the House on the left of the Episcopal Bench. The Lord President of the Council is strolling into the lobby. The leader of the Opposition is chatting to a noble duke who sits immediately behind him. But after a while the preliminaries come to an end, and then, if there is to be a real debate, and not merely a discursive conversation, the debate begins.

It is not to be supposed that the debate itself will be wanting either in interest or excitement. The

speeches, whatever the subject may be, which are most successful, and which elicit the greatest manifestations of applause, are to all intents and purposes House of Commons speeches, yet the interest attaching to the discussion is of a kind entirely different from that attaching to debates in the Lower Chamber of the legislature. There is no widely diffused sense of the collective wisdom of the assemblage; the object is not to know what the House will say, but what particular members of the House will say. The attraction is found rather in the individuals than in the institution, whereas it is just the reverse of this which holds true in the case of the House of Commons. It may, indeed, almost be said that the fame of a few illustrious peers eclipses the prestige of the assembly in which they sit, and though the House of Peers owes much of its power and influence to the fact that its members have their seats there by right of birth, it is not, and it never has been, a house where the most influential members are the greatest noblemen. Here there is at work, as elsewhere in our constitution, that subtly democratising tendency which is yet such a guarantee of the stability of our aristocratic system. The vote and speech of the biggest duke do not, because of the accident of the ducal dignity, carry more weight than that of the viscount or baron. It is true that, as has been already said, there is in the House of Lords a sort of *imperium in imperio*, and that the rank and file of the members do not as a rule actively take part in the proceedings. But when once the critic comes to the charmed circle he will find that



its most important members are those of the highest political aptitude.

All this time the reader has been kept waiting on the threshold of the actual discussion. Under the strangers' gallery, immediately opposite the semi-circular space where the throne is, and which is reserved for Privy Councillors and the sons of peers, is an oblong enclosure, also railed off, which is known as the bar. Hither press a mixed throng of members of the House of Commons and visitors from outside, for an important discussion is expected, and it may even be that their lordships will stoop to personalities. The debate begins with dignity, and, save for the voice of the speaker, with silence. There are few cries of "hear, hear," there are fewer cheers. The orator may be the Prime Minister himself, but his audience succeed in presenting an appearance of comparative indifference. One noble lord transacts as much as he can of his private and official correspondence, leaning forward to the table ever and anon to dip his pen in the ink; another beats time to an imaginary melody with his fingers on his knees; a third lapses into seeming somnolence; a fourth, and he, perhaps, the most keenly interested of all, folds his arms and sits unmoved and immovable, to all outward seeming, as granite. This state of things lasts for some little time, until, indeed, either the present or some subsequent speaker touches upon a theme which at once lets loose the bitter waters of party or personal strife. Some imputation has been made, and an explanation is demanded;

*1862*

it is given, it is not satisfactory, and thus the wrangle continues. But these effervescences are of very exceptional occurrence, and, indeed, it is rare when any debate in the Lords takes place which is not concluded before the dinner-hour. More than one proposal has recently been made that the House of Lords should meet earlier and rise later, and there are signs of a growing appetite for work at the present time among the Peers. Momentous questions of foreign policy will perhaps never be the subject of general debate, but it is pointed out that there are a host of matters connected with army reform, local government, railway business, and a variety of matters connected with domestic administration on which many noblemen who are now systematically silent might make themselves periodically heard, and might, by speaking on these matters, acquire a valuable parliamentary training. As matters are, it is part of the duty of lords in waiting to do regular work in a Government office during the tenure of their posts, and consequently these officials are no longer the mere ornaments of a Court that they once were. Why, it has been asked, should not the number of these appointments with their corresponding obligations be increased, and if that step prove impracticable, why should not some sort of occupation be found? It must, however, be remembered that their lordships accomplish a great deal more work now than meets the public eye. The House of Lords, too, has, like the House of Commons, its own elaborate system of private Bill legislation, and attendance at

select committees is quite as much the duty of the hereditary as of the elective legislator. Whenever any of the proposals which have been made above are suggested, the answer is that there is already experienced a great difficulty in ensuring an adequate attendance of members on these select committees. The powers which may be exercised by the Chairman of Committees in the House of Lords are so extensive and even absolute that no comparison in this respect between the two assemblies is possible. The present holder of the office in the Peers—the Earl of Redesdale—may be almost described as a sort of constitution in himself. There is a more specific difference between the procedure of the select committees of the House of Commons and select committees of the House of Lords, that in the former case, whereas the public are, as a rule, admitted, from the latter they are, with few exceptions, excluded.

Between the rules and the routine of the two Chambers of the legislature there is a general resemblance. The quorum of the Upper House is not forty, but three. At the table of the House are seated the three clerks, as in the case of the House of Commons, who take down minutes of the proceedings and receive all notices of motion. Much greater laxity prevails as to the rules regulating the asking of questions in the Lords than in the Commons. Questions are very often asked by members of the Opposition of the Government, or by one peer of another, with a notice that would be deemed inadequate in the Commons, or, possibly, without any notice at all. Nor, although it is pro-

hibited to mention by name in the course of a debate any peer, has that rule been as rigidly adhered to in the Peers during the last few years as in the Commons. Here, as in the Commons, all proposals submitted to the House resolve themselves into questions asked of the Speaker, which have to be answered in the negative or affirmative. But in the House of Lords the "ayes" are spoken of as the "contents," and the "noes" as the "non-contents." The manner of taking a division resembles, since effect was given to certain changes made on the motion of the late Lord Stanhope, that adopted in the Commons. The lobbies on the right and left of the House, after having been cleared of strangers, are guarded with locked doors; two tellers are appointed for each party; the contents going into the right lobby and the non-contents into the left, and as they return into the House the votes are counted and are announced to the Lord Chancellor or to the Speaker of the House, who is, of course, the chairman, if the division has taken place in committee.

In this general review of the House of Lords, as it at present exists, two or three facts prominently stand forth. In the first place, while the House of Lords is an assembly representative of great interests, high intellectual excellence, success and prosperity, and all the qualities which command success and prosperity, it retains its aristocratic prestige unimpaired. Secondly, valuable as its discussions always are on critical and complicated themes of imperial policy, mature and finished as is the quality of its statesmanship, there

is a definite promise of more legislative activity and influence among its rising members. Hence in a democratic age, it is gaining rather than losing power, and, although the traditions and habits of aristocratic dependence have disappeared, it is felt that an aristocratic hereditary legislature, which does its work well, stands on unassailable ground. The very fact that the functions of the House of Lords are critical rather than constructive, while it gives their lordships less opportunity of national display, increases their capacities for national usefulness. It is also to the House of Lords, rather than to the House of Commons, that we must look to preserve the standard of English statesmanship and English parliamentary speaking. Incompetent speakers there doubtless are among the peers, but they perhaps break silence less often than in the House of Commons. As for the best of the regular speakers, their utterances are seldom without two merits—lucidity and compression. As a corrective to the diffuseness and obscurity which are the bane of the House of Commons' rhetoricians, the speeches in the House of Lords would alone be of extreme value.

A few words remain to be said on the relation in which the House of Lords stands to the two great parties in the State. Whereas there are few respects in which the staunch Liberal would advocate reform in our second Chamber, the Conservative would not deny that their lordships' House might submit to several modifications with advantage. Thus there are many Conservatives in favour of the creation of life-

peers; but, with two exceptions, it is exceedingly doubtful how far the representative Liberal would be in favour of any reform at all in their lordships' body. These exceptions are the disqualification of bishops to sit in the Peers, and the introduction of the Minority Vote into the election of Scotch and Irish representative peers; the former would be hailed by Liberalism as a step towards, and as involving the principle of, the disestablishment of the English Church; the second, as a guarantee that the representative lords of Ireland and Scotland would be, in some cases, Liberals. For the rest, the Liberal politician would oppose reform of the House of Lords for the same reasons that the Conservative would advocate it; such a measure, the former would contend, must strengthen and not weaken the influence of a second Chamber, whereas a certain phase of Liberalism is pretty generally opposed to the existence of any second Chamber at all. The House of Lords, argues the Liberal, is quite strong enough as matters are, and exercises a sufficiently sinister force upon the course of legislation.

That the influence of the House of Lords upon the deliberations and the Acts of Parliament is, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, a very real thing, there can be no doubt. But it is not exercised in the old way, nor is it exercised in the manner which some persons may alone imagine to be possible. Such collisions between the two Houses as those which took place over the Reform Bill in

1832, or in the matter of the repeal of the paper duty, are not likely to come again. So far as the course of legislation is concerned, once it has commenced, the authority of the Peers is rather seen, as has been said, in the revision of the edicts of the Commons than in the thwarting of them. But there is a great deal of authority exercised which does not come before the public at all. The real influence of their lordships is invisible rather than visible. They prevent certain measures being introduced quite as much as they control them when introduced. Whatever may be the case with the country, the Conservative party are always sure to have an overwhelming majority amongst the Peers. Hence, it is always theoretically possible for the Upper House to reject any measure passed by the Lower House which may offend the prejudices of Conservatism. A Liberal Cabinet, we may suppose, meditates the introduction of a Bill which is considered fatally to affect some great Conservative interest; their lordships get wind of the proposal, and politely, but firmly, hint that it will not do. What is, or, at least, what may be the consequence? The measure is either shelved or else watered down to such an extent that its drastic powers disappear.

Further, it must always be remembered that the solid and substantial interests of a majority of the Whig aristocracy are, in their essence, identical with those of the Tory peers. Our British noblesse exists upon a basis of landed property. Nothing which does not

•

strike at these exclusive territorial privileges can seriously impair the position of the Conservative peer; nothing which does so strike at them can be acceptable to the Whigs. Again, there are certain constitutional rights, the collective possession of the House of Lords, in whose preservation Whigs and Tories are equally interested. A few years ago, when it was proposed to rob their lordships of their judicial powers, a great Tory nobleman, who was in the habit of holding weekly a lodge at his private house—the gentlemen attending which made it their special business to watch current or expected legislation in the interests of Conservatism—rallied round him at the critical moment the support not only of the peers of his own party, but of many who on ordinary occasions were opposed to him. So strong was this combination of noblemen, taking their stand upon the common ground of the privileges of nobility, that the Lord Chancellor of the day was compelled to surrender those clauses of a measure which would have transferred the judicial attributes of their lordships to a committee.

The Lords and Commons may still look at matters from a different point of view, but they do not parade their quarrels as they formerly did. Their disputes have ceased to take place in public, and all that the public knows of the dispute is the result born of diplomatic negotiation and compromise. Now, compromise beyond a certain point is the one thing which the thorough-going Liberal disapproves, and hence his



natural dislike of a House of Lords, or of any second Chamber at all. In the natural antagonism, sometimes suppressed, at others openly asserted, between the principles of Liberalism and the House of Lords, may be seen the reason why all Liberal administrations are likely to be less long-lived than Conservative. Between a Conservative Government and a House of Lords there is an open and durable alliance; between a Liberal administration and a House of Lords there is constantly present the probability of feud. Sooner or later the elements of strife assert themselves, the water begins to be troublesome, and the foundering of the ship is imminent. In 1869 the Liberal majority in the House of Commons could have carried absolute fixity of tenure in the Irish Land Act, but it was known that the House of Lords, as an assemblage of land-owners, would not submit to such a clause, and it was consequently deemed impracticable to pursue the idea.

So far as the political and constitutional future of England is concerned, there are two prophecies which may be made without incurring the charge of rashness proverbially attendant on prediction. It can scarcely be doubted that when household suffrage is given, as sooner or later it is sure to be, to country voters, the entire aspect of party politics will be materially altered. For the first time in the parliamentary history of England it is possible that even in the representation of counties—those strongholds of Toryism—the Liberals would command

an absolute majority. This majority would enable Liberal statesmanship to proceed in a more daring spirit, and to attempt to realise bolder and more sweeping conceptions than it has yet ventured to do. What actual use would be made of this opportunity, what practical result the possibility would yield, must be matter of opinion. There are those who hold that the latent revolutionary instincts of the English people would display themselves without disguise, and that we should at once enter upon a new order of subversive legislative enterprise. On the other hand, there will be those who, giving their due weight to the facts and illustrations which have been produced elsewhere in this work, and recollecting that the political life of Englishmen is not distinct from their social life; that the influences which leaven the masses are not democratic but aristocratic, or as aristocratic as the plutocratic agencies at work will allow; that there is no impassable gulf fixed between one class and another, and that admiration for rank almost seems innate in the English breast—there are those who, bearing these circumstances in mind, will hold that household suffrage in counties will bring us no nearer to revolution than did the Reform Bill of 1832, which, it was ominously predicted at the time, by alarmist prophets, would be quickly followed by a reign of terror.

These are questions which the reader must decide for himself. One other point there is on which a definite opinion may be expressed. It is conceivable that in

years to come events may occur tending in the direction of a very grave strife between the privileged classes and the multitude on property in land. But imagine the most disastrous contingency that can possibly be realised, a strife that should practically culminate in civil war. How would this affect the tenure of the Crown? The Crown would certainly have nothing to gain by flinging its influence into the scale of the aristocracy, and it would certainly have much to lose if the aristocracy were beaten. Probably there is no practical politician living who holds that any political conjuncture at home is likely to present itself which can seriously jeopardise the existence of the monarchy. If a Nero or Caligula were to come to the throne, possibly there would be more than danger; there might be certainty of overthrow. But these are not the monsters which the atmosphere of royalty in the nineteenth century develops. Follies and extravagances we indeed may have, and it is perhaps more reasonable to anticipate the theatrical wantonness of a Louis of Bavaria than the portentous eccentricities of the most debased of the Cæsars, or even the attempted personal government of the last of the Hanoverian kings. It is not possible to conceive of the English monarchy as perishing except amid a universal cataclysm.\* A colossal European war, followed by

\* A distinguished statesman writes to me as follows on the opinion expressed in the text:—"This is, I admit, a fair and reasonable view; but I can easily conceive another alternative, and one quite as probable. The ordinary progress of modern democracy might silently and gradually absorb the monarchy into a presidency without cataclysm or even struggle."

grinding taxation, the total loss of our carrying trade at the hands of privateers scouring the high seas, the consequent deprivation of industry and livelihood to thousands of our population which this loss would imply, the blocking up of the channels of emigration, attended perhaps by the secession or the conquest of some of our most important colonies, a population overgrown, starving and desperate, pent up within the narrow limits of the United Kingdom—this is a combination of calamities which might indeed provoke a movement fatal to the English monarchy; but before that went everything else would have gone. The Crown would not perish singly, and on the day that it ceased to exist as an institution the structure of English society would be in danger of falling to pieces. It is only upon the fulfilment of some such hypothesis as this, and not as a consequence of any national fit of political discontent, however deep or long, that the destruction of the monarchy can present itself as a contingency that need be reckoned with.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

### THE LAW COURTS.

The Policeman—Police Courts—Committal—Quarter Sessions—Grand Jury—Trial of Indictment—Court of Crown Cases—High Court—Writ—Sheriff's Court—Pleadings—Law and Equity—Judges' Chambers—Interrogatories—Trial of Action—Divisional Court—Court of Appeal—Supreme Court—House of Lords—County Courts—Judgment Summonses—Appeal from County Courts—Courts Spiritual—The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

To a vast number of law-obeying and law-protected Englishmen and women the only visible embodiment of the law under which they live is the police constable. He is the outermost wheel in the great and complicated mechanism which is charged with the duty of maintaining the broad outline of social relations. Fortunately, he is in himself a very simple legal unit, being little more than one of the people put into a blue uniform, his figure improved by drill, and his intelligence sharpened by experience in applying on emergencies a few plain rules. In England he is not, as in other countries, much under the control of the central Government, being appointed and regulated by county justices, or the local authority of a borough. He is, in fact, the servant of the people and of the law. Stationed in a country village, he is looked up to as an oracle, and in the crowded courts and alleys of a town, where from want of elbow-room much friction of the social machine occurs, he is often the needful arbitrator and

peacemaker. In this character he may be considered a legal tribunal of the very first instance.

Apart from the visible presence of the police constable, the law is hardly realised until it is broken. Like the air, it is always above and around us, but is not fully valued until withdrawn. *Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator*; but every one who carries about him what is worth stealing is constantly in need of the protection of the law. Viator may pass half a lifetime without knowing anything of the actual working of his omnipresent protector, yet one day he may be looking into a shop-window and feel a tug at his watch. The instinct of self-protection makes him seize the man standing near, who, he believes, has it. Then he remembers the police constable, and at once the law becomes to him a real existence. A policeman arrives, and the first thing he does after hearing what has happened is to ask, "Do you give him in charge?" Viator thinks he cannot be mistaken; there was only one other person before the shop-window besides himself and the man in question, and that person has disappeared. On the other hand, the captive is loud in his protestations. He is an honest man, one Latro, a French-polisher, who lives in Furcifer Street. He is as innocent as the babe unborn. Let them search him, and if he has the gentleman's watch, he will say no more. This flood of eloquence a little puzzles Viator, but it seems to have little effect on the constable, and Latro is given in charge. The law has now been

fairly set in motion, and we shall see what happens next.

The constable and Latro start together to the police-station, and Viator is desired to follow. Here they find an inspector of police, who enters the charge in the station records. Latro is searched and no watch is found on him, but meanwhile a constable has gone round to Furcifer Street, and no Latro is known at the address, nor any French-polisher. Prosecutor, constable, and prisoner thereupon proceed to the police court, and we now first find ourselves in a court of law. The magistrate is seated, without official dress, at a desk placed in front of a small library of law books. He is a lawyer, of the class called stipendiary magistrates, who, in places where the magisterial work is arduous, are commonly substituted for the Petty Sessions, that is to say, two or more country gentlemen, or it may be aldermen, who, without salary, exercise the same jurisdiction as the stipendiary in districts where the business is lighter. Opposite to the magistrate, and at the end of a table, at which there are seats for the lawyers, is the dock, enclosed with an iron rail; and at the other end of the table, under the magistrate, sits the clerk of the court, whose duty it is to take notes of the evidence. The magistrate is just finishing his list of "night charges," and the latest claimants for justice must wait their turn. Cases of drunkenness are visited with a fine of some shillings, or in the alternative a few days' imprisonment. Then there are cases of

violence. A husband has been beating his wife, and the wife, having given him into custody, now begs earnestly for his release. In another case the assault is very grievous, and the husband has drawn so often on the wife's forbearance that the fund is exhausted. The magistrate orders a separation, under a statute passed in the year 1878, so that the wife is acquitted of her matrimonial misadventure, although to allow her to marry again is beyond magisterial jurisdiction. After these charges there is a prisoner who has been caught in the act of attempted robbery during the day. His offence, being the first, is sufficiently punished by four months' imprisonment. It was but an hour ago that the law was broken, and its vindication has been speedy. At length Latro is put into the dock, and is for the first time a little abashed by the scrutinising glance of the gaoler in court. Viator is sworn as a witness, and details his mishap. The policeman is sworn also, and proof is given that the prisoner's address was false. But the evidence, although suspicious, is not sufficient, as Viator did not see his watch taken, and no watch has been found. Then the magistrate asks, "Is anything known of the man?" and the gaoler replies that he thinks he is known; whereupon a remand is ordered, and Latro is locked up.

Interested in what are to him novel proceedings, Viator remains a short time in court. He hears an affiliation order made for the payment of five shillings a week by the father of the child; and a summons



against a licensed victualler for Sunday trading dismissed, on the ground that the person served was a *bonâ fide* traveller, and therefore legitimately thirsty. There are besides cross-summonses with most conflicting evidence for assaults and a case of burglary depending entirely on circumstantial evidence adjourned from a previous sitting. Finally Viator goes away leaving the magistrate painfully unravelling a charge of commercial fraud.

A day or two later Viator is required again at the station to see whether he can identify the man who ran away when his watch was stolen, as the police think they have found him. He is taken into a room where there are seven or eight men, and among them he recognises the eloper. A description of the watch had been inserted in the *Police Gazette*, and information had been obtained that the watch was offered in pawn by a woman who turned out to be the wife of the man now identified. The watch was found in his house, and both he and the man already in custody have been previously convicted of stealing. The evidence is now complete, and when all concerned go before the magistrate, both prisoners are committed to take their trial before a jury, as the magistrate has no power to dispose summarily of such repeated offenders. The offence was not committed within the district of the Central Criminal Court, so that the prisoners must be tried either at the Assizes when the judge comes round on circuit, or at the Quarter

Sessions, which have power to try most criminal cases except burglary and murder. The sessions take place first, and accordingly the prisoners are committed for trial at that court.

On the Bench of the Quarter Sessions we find a county magnate by way of Chairman, with another magistrate on each side of him. Neither of the three is a lawyer or has had any legal training, but they administer justice gratuitously, with the assistance of the Clerk of the Peace, who is a salaried lawyer occupying no mean position in the county. The Quarter Sessions sat yesterday in a numerous body to administer the business of the county in respect of bridges, police, and the like, and to-day they meet for judicial purposes. The first business is to charge the Grand Jury. They are gentlemen of the county and respectable yeomen, although of a lower social rank than at the Assizes, where the Grand Jury are reinforced by men of the class who now sit on the Bench. The Grand Jurors, some twenty in all, are sworn, standing in a gallery at one side of the court, and the Chairman proceeds to charge them by referring shortly to the cases in the calendar of criminals, and telling them that if they think there is sufficient evidence to make it proper for the case to be tried they ought to find a true bill. The Grand Jury then retire to their room, for their sittings are held in private, and they are bound not to disclose their deliberations. In due course Viator and the other witnesses in his case are summoned into the Grand

Jury room, and tell their story shortly to the Grand Jury. After a time the Grand Jury reappear in their gallery, the foreman carrying several pieces of parchment in his hand. These are handed down to the Clerk of the Peace, who sits under the Bench for the purpose of giving the magistrates legal advice. The Clerk of the Peace looks at the back of each document to see what the Grand Jurors have there certified under the hand of their foreman. "Gentlemen of the Grand Jury, you find a true bill against Latro and another for larceny from the person." The foreman bows, and thus the "bill," which had been prepared in legal form for the Grand Jury's authorisation, becomes the "indictment," or formal charge upon which the prisoners will be tried.

It is some time before Viator's case comes on for trial, and he wanders into the second court. This court is a duplicate of the other, but as it has no Grand Jury to charge it takes in hand some of the civil and appellate cases which come before the Quarter Sessions. Permission is given to one applicant to keep a lunatic asylum; to another to open a slaughter-house; to a third to divert a road passing over his property. Then a licensing appeal is heard. Mr. Boniface, through his counsel, complains that the magistrates who sat to grant licenses have improperly declined to renew his license. His house has been in existence for twenty years, and there have been no complaints. On the other hand, a rival to Boniface, who has taken up the case against him, declares that more licenses are by no means required in his

neighbourhood, and Boniface has opened a tap at the side of his house in a fashionable thoroughfare which is an annoyance to promenaders. The matter ends by Boniface promising to close the tap, and obtaining his license. Next, there is an appeal from a summary decision of the stipendiary whose acquaintance we have already made, convicting the appellant of an assault; witnesses are called and the case is tried all over again. The Quarter Sessions affirm or quash the conviction, as justice, in their opinion, requires.

But Viator is called away, as his case is about to begin. "Latro, you are charged with stealing a watch on such a day from the person of Viator, are you guilty or not guilty?" This comes from the Clerk of the Peace, and Latro replies "Not Guilty." A similar ceremony is gone through with the other prisoner. They have in legal phrase "put themselves on the country," and their country is rapidly represented, subject perhaps to the winnowing process of challenging the jurors, by twelve men in the jury-box, mostly farmers and tradesmen, who are sworn, "Well and truly to try the issue joined between our Sovereign Lady the Queen and the prisoners at the bar, and a true verdict give according to the evidence." The counsel for the prosecution first briefly details the facts of the case. He is a young barrister, for it is at Quarter Sessions that young barristers are trained to the work of their profession. He then calls the witnesses and elicits the facts from them by questions. The prisoners have no counsel to defend them, but Latro cross-examines the witnesses

with some ingenuity. His companion in durance is stolidly silent all through. The prisoners call no witnesses, but Latro makes a voluble appeal to the jury, disclaiming any knowledge of the other man, and protesting that they cannot convict him simply because he happened to be standing by when the gentleman lost his watch. What surprises Viator is that all through the trial not a single reference is made to the previous conviction of both prisoners, facts in his opinion most significant. But the law is of opinion that facts like these, if known to the jury, will prejudice the fair trial of the existing charge, and it is not until the jury have found a verdict of "Guilty" that the prisoners are asked whether they have not been previously convicted of stealing a pair of boots. They both plead guilty to this fact, although Latro, amid laughter, says he did not take the boots all the same, and are sentenced to penal servitude—which has been defined by a Chief Justice as a condition of slavery—for seven years.

Most criminal trials end with the verdict and sentence, and in the case of a simple crime no difficult point of law is likely to arise to require consideration in a higher court. Still, even in an ordinary case of stealing there may be a question of law, such as whether an admission of the accused tending to show his guilt was admissible in evidence; for the English law has a constitutional horror of proving guilt from the mouth of the prisoner, and always rejects an admission if there was any appearance of its being

extorted either by fear of punishment or hope of escape. If the judge at the trial thinks there is a point of law in a criminal case, he states the facts in writing for the opinion of the Court for the Consideration of Crown Cases Reserved, where it is argued and determined. This court is as numerous in its composition as its name is long, being composed of all the three-and-twenty judges of the High Court of Justice. Ordinarily five judges only sit, but in the celebrated case of the *Franconia*, the German vessel which ran down an English ship within three miles of our shore, fourteen judges sat to decide whether the captain, who was a German, was criminally responsible in the English courts. Six judges thought he was, and seven thought he was not, while the fourteenth died between the argument and the judgment, thus perhaps saving the court from being equally divided. Quantity rather than quality is not a satisfactory basis for a Court of Appeal, and the time may come when criminal appeals will be taken like other appeals to the House of Lords. To have but one Court of Appeal favours the expedition which is essential to the due punishment of crime; but when appeals are few, to take them to the highest source of law is not likely much to prejudice persons in the position of Viator.

If Viator only makes acquaintance with the law through a casual loss of his watch, law is to Dominus more or less a matter of business. Dominus has money invested in house property, and he must be a lucky man indeed if he does not every now and again find

the law's assistance necessary to the management of his investments. Possessor is the tenant of one of his houses, with a lease for fourteen years, subject to a rent payable quarterly, and a liability of the tenant to repair. The rent is in arrear for a whole year, the premises are grievously out of repair, and altogether Possessor is an unsatisfactory tenant. Dominus wishes to get rid of his tenant, and consults his solicitor. The lease, as usual, contains a provision that if the rent is in arrear, and the premises in disrepair, the remainder of the term is to be forfeited and the landlord may recover possession of his property. An action of ejectment is therefore advised to carry out this desirable purpose. Accordingly a writ is issued, say, in the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, claiming, according to the endorsement on the back, possession of the house, the rent due, and damages for failure to repair. It is just possible that Possessor may not care to defend his lease, and although the writ is served upon him, does not intimate his intention of disputing the claim by entering an appearance at the offices of the court. In this case Dominus may sign judgment upon the lapse of a specified time, and his damages for dilapidations will be assessed by a jury in the Sheriff's Court, where assessments of damages upon non-appearance to the writ usually take place. But Possessor is a much more accommodating tenant than is usual with his class if he takes this course. In all probability he will appear, and Dominus must prepare himself for a regular legal campaign.

He has first of all to extend his line in the form of a "Claim." This is the beginning of the so-called "pleadings," which are not pleadings in the ordinary sense at all, but a series of written attacks on the enemy made by each side alternately for the purpose of reconnoitring one another's positions, before actually engaging in open court. Formerly pleading was a mystery known to few but "special pleaders." These practitioners still exist, but the class is rapidly becoming absorbed into the ordinary ranks of lawyers, and the business of a special pleader is sadly curtailed by reason of the inroads made of late years by common sense upon legal cobwebs, especially the Common Law Procedure Act of 1852, and the Judicature Act of 1873. Dominus will find the "claim" in his case, although prepared by counsel learned in the law, to be moderately intelligible to lay capacity. It propounds the facts that he is owner of the property; that he granted the lease to Possessor, the defendant; that the lease contained covenants to pay rent and repair, and a clause of forfeiture upon breach of those covenants; that the covenants have been broken, and that accordingly Dominus wants his property back, together with his rent, and damages for not repairing. Possessor's turn now comes, and he retorts with his "Defence," in which he states that he pays into court the rent in arrear, together with interest, and denies that the premises are out of repair. All that Dominus can do in answer is to take his rent out of court, and in



his "Reply," which is the next step in the pleadings, to "take issue" on the question of the repairs, which is the orthodox way of reiterating his view of the facts, and avowing his readiness to establish it by proof in court.

In order to understand the meaning of Possessor's manœuvre, something of the difference in the English system of jurisprudence between law and equity must be known. Law as distinguished from equity always keeps a man strictly to his bond. Whatever he undertakes to do, unless it is either illegal or physically impossible, he must do, or must suffer the consequences prescribed in his contract. Equity is less logical, and if the consequences are cruel, or altogether disproportionate to the offence, it releases the person under the obligation from the consequences of breaking it. For instance, according to the lease granted by Dominus, if the rent were in arrear for a fixed time, the term granted was, according to the principles of law, at once forfeited, although the rent were tendered the day after the expiration of the time fixed. According, however, to a rule established in equity, if the tenant, on an attempt being made to evict him, paid the rent, together with interest and the costs incurred by the landlord, he might retain the lease. This is why Possessor paid the rent into court. As, however, he resisted giving up the property, he was bound to dispute that it was out of repair, because equity has declined to interfere with the strict principle of law in the case where a forfeiture occurs through not repairing.

This inconsistency shows that equity, although originally founded on the attribute from which it takes its name, is as rigid in its rules as law itself. Until the reform lately carried by Lords Selborne and Cairns, instead of pleading equity as a defence, it was necessary to go to the Court of Chancery to have one's opponent ordered not to press his rights in the other courts, which were courts of law only. There were, in fact, two jurisprudential establishments, each with no connection with its rival over the way, and in their early days of rivalry cordially hating one another. The reform referred to, which rather late in the day adopted an established principle of business in legal administration, makes it possible to obtain all the law and equity requisite for one's case at the same store. It thus came about that Dominus and Possessor were at issue on the question of repairs.

Meanwhile, there has been some little skirmishing at "Judges' Chambers." These are rooms in Rolls Gardens, Chancery Lane, where a judge sits to bring to book either side who, in the reconnoitring preliminary to trial, may have offended against the laws of war. If the pleading be worded vaguely or evasively, the offender is made to repent and amend. "Interrogatories" are another form of attack which have often to be regulated at Judges' Chambers. These are the only instrument of torture now known to the law, by means of which a litigant may ask his antagonist on paper any questions material to the action, and have them answered in the same way. Possessor has asked Dominus some very troublesome questions, tending to show that Dominus

condoned the forfeiture of the lease. Dominus appeals to the judge at chambers to say whether he is to submit to the impertinence. He has to submit, but finds when he swears his answer, as drawn up by his lawyers, that he has not given his adversary much information of any use to him after all.

All the preliminaries having been settled, Dominus now gives his adversary notice that he is ready to try the case before a special jury of Middlesex—that is to say, a jury composed of merchants, bankers, and professional men, as distinguished from the rank and file of jurors. After the delay inseparable from law, Dominus sees the case of "*Dominus v. Possessor*" in the law notices of his morning's newspaper, and posts down to Westminster Hall. There was no reason for any great hurry, as there are several cases in front. The judge is sitting in the plain black robes always worn when a judge sits alone to try civil cases, in a court full of law and lawyers, but deficient in air. There is a great display of bleached horsehair on the Bar benches. Those gentlemen in silk gowns in the front row are Queen's counsel. The gentlemen in stuff gowns on the back benches are junior counsel, not honoured with the complimentary retainer of the Crown. The difference between the two is substantial. Queen's counsel earn higher fees, but are not able to do routine work, such as devising those pleadings and answers to interrogatories before mentioned. Nominally, the higher rank is conferred through the grace and favour of the Crown; but, in fact, any barrister of

reputation, if there is room for a new Queen's counsel on his circuit, may "take silk" by asking the Chancellor. Many find the humbler "stuff" more remunerative. In the "well," a seat a step below that of the Queen's counsel, sit the solicitors, ready to give their counsel a reminder when needed. But the Associate, the official sitting under the judge, has sworn the jury, and a case has begun. It is an action brought by a man who fell down a cellar in a public-house, and claims compensation. The next case is an action on a bill of exchange, in which the defendant contends that he was induced to give the bill by fraud. Then follows an action in which the plaintiff, a maiden lady, complains of a livery stable as a nuisance. The horses, she says, make a great noise, and keep her awake, and she asks for an injunction to the defendant to conduct his business with more consideration for her nerves. Then we have an action for the non-delivery of a cargo of wheat, and an action for breach of promise of marriage, in which the young lady creates the usual amount of interest, and the man has written the ordinary quantity of nonsense. Then comes an action of libel, which the jury seem to think is a case of the pot against the kettle, as they return as damages the farthing which has so often been given in the same circumstances, but from which so few take warning not to tempt their fate.

At last, and perhaps after a day or two of waiting, "*Dominus and Possessor*" is called, and the jury are sworn. Each side is represented by a Queen's counsel

and a junior counsel. The junior counsel for the plaintiff begins by "opening the pleadings"—that is, informing the jury in a dozen words or so what are the names of the litigants, what the action is about, and what questions appear to be in dispute between them. His "leader" then rises and addresses the court and jury at length, telling the whole story of the difficulties of Dominus with his tenant, and asks the jury to end them by turning the tenant out. Dominus himself is then sworn, and is examined by his junior counsel. He is cross-examined by the defendant's Queen's counsel, and a few questions are put to him thirdly by his own leading counsel, with a view to re-establish his evidence if at all damaged by the cross-examination. The same process is gone through in the case of the surveyor and the builder, who are next called. While these witnesses are examined the judge inquires whether the jury are to be asked to assess the amount, if any, which Possessor ought to have spent on repairs. The counsel for Dominus thereupon suggests that the amount should be referred to an official referee, if the jury find that some repairs ought to have been done. The defendant's counsel agree, and Dominus is content, because if he can turn Possessor out to make room for a better tenant, he does not care much for the repairs. The surveyor goes on to detail how the ceiling of the back parlour had fallen in, the boiler and water-pipes were out of order, the floor of the pantry damaged, and so on. The defendant's Queen's counsel then takes up the parable, and

declares that Dominus with his rent in his pocket, and his house in a tolerably good state of repair, is as well off as he deserves, without wanting to turn Possessor out into the street. As to the house, Dominus knew its state all along, and has taken rent from Possessor since, and therefore he cannot now forfeit the lease on the allegation that it is out of repair. Witnesses are called to support this view of the matter, and Dominus, to his surprise, finds his own witnesses about the want of repairs flatly contradicted. The counsel for his opponent then "sums up" his evidence, and his own counsel replies on the whole case. The judge then proceeds to charge the jury, and tells them that they must first consider whether the house was substantially in want of repair, and if they after weighing the evidence think that it was, then, did the plaintiff receive rent knowing what the real state of the house was, so as to waive or condone the forfeiture. The jury, after retiring to consult, find as their verdict that the house was out of repair, but that the plaintiff knew of its state and took his rent, but that the house had again fallen into disrepair since. Both sides upon this claim the verdict, and the judge says that he cannot give his decision now, but must reserve the matter for further consideration.

Dominus now finds himself embarked on a considerable litigation. The judge after a week or two hears an argument on the question of law, and decides against Dominus. Thereupon he appeals to the Court

of Appeal, but meanwhile Possessor, not to be outdone, applies to a Divisional Court for a new trial on the ground that the verdict was against the weight of the evidence with regard to the need of repairs, and that the judge did not rightly direct the jury in point of law. The law does not consider juries infallible, and sometimes sets their verdicts aside, if the judge who tried the case thinks that they were misled. In the Divisional Court Dominus finds two judges, one of whom happens to be the judge who tried his case. They wear scarlet and ermine robes, as it is a saint's day, and not the black and ermine ordinarily worn in the Divisional Court in winter, or the violet robes of summer. Possessor has obtained an order to show cause why there should not be a new trial, and Dominus's counsel have to show cause. Possessor's counsel are then heard in support of his contention, and the judges decide that there must be no new trial. The verdict therefore stands, and success for Dominus depends on his persuading the Court of Appeal that its effect is to entitle him to judgment.

The Court of Appeal is composed of three Lords Justices. The other three, making up the six permanent judges of the Court, are sitting in another chamber, hearing appeals which have more equity than law in them. The three judges in either chamber are sometimes supplemented by the Lord Chancellor himself, who ordinarily only sits in the House of Lords; or the Master of the Rolls, who is commonly to be found sitting by himself, hearing equity cases; or the Chief

Justice of England, the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, or the Chief Baron, who usually preside in Divisional Courts or take jury cases. These supplementary judges of the Court of Appeal belong both to that court and the High Court, which together are called the Supreme Court of Judicature. The Lords Justices wear their judicial wigs, but nothing more showy in the way of judicial costume than the black silk gown which is the least of the ceremonial costumes of the judges. Dominus wonders why an Appeal Court should be arrayed in less glory than the court below. But the fact is, the Court of Appeal took its origin from a court of consultation rather than of jurisdiction, and the black gown is the fatigue dress of judges. The mysteries of judicial millinery are indeed great, and can be fathomed probably by no one but the oldest "body clerk" among the attendants of the judges. On the first day of Michaelmas sittings the Lords Justices, when they march up Westminster Hall, wear a black robe liberally sprinkled with gold lace; but when they go circuit, and try prisoners, they become "red judges" so familiar to the eyes of the criminal classes. On solemn occasions, as in the Westminster Hall procession or in charging a Grand Jury, the judges always wear the full-bottomed wig, a head-dress which looks from behind like a straw bee-hive and in front gives them the appearance of Egyptian sphinxes—instead of the short uncurled wig now worn by the Lords Justices. For Court or personal mourning, both judges and Queen's counsel



wear their bands with a stripe or fold down the middle, and lawn cuffs or "weepers" on their sleeves. Both the counsel of Dominus are heard in support of the appeal, and Possessor's counsel are heard on the other side. A great deal is said about continuous breach, and waiver, and other things which Dominus imperfectly understands, but the upshot is that the court reverse the decision of the judge, and enter judgment for Dominus.

But Possessor will not give up his judgment easily, and he appeals to the House of Lords, the court of law of the last resort for Great Britain and Ireland. Here English cases find themselves in company with Irish appeals, which are similar in kind, and decided according to the same legal principles, and Scotch appeals coming from an altogether distinct jurisprudence, with law terms strange and uncouth to the English lawyer, in whose eyes the law of Scotland is the law of a foreign country. The argument takes place in the gilded chamber where the Lords sit for legislation. The Queen's counsel are in their full-bottomed wigs; the Lord Chancellor is on the woolsack in his wig and robes, but the other members present, although lawyers, wear no official costume. They sit not as judges, nor as lawyers, but as peers; and it is only by a custom barely a hundred years old that lay peers do not take part in the decision of the legal questions submitted to their House. Of late years, under an Act of Parliament passed in 1876, peerages for life have been instituted for the purpose of conferring them on

lawyers ; and these life peers, together with the ex-Chancellors and other lawyers who may have been ennobled, are the effective force of the House as a law court. Dominus observes that the atmosphere of the highest Court of Appeal in the country is serener than that of the courts below. The arguments proceed smoothly and with little interruption, and afterwards the Lords deliver their opinions one by one, in the form of arguments for the consideration of the House, and not judgments. The opinion of the Lords is the same as that of the Court of Appeal, and Dominus is triumphant. All this time, however, Possessor has stuck to the house like a limpet, and the lease has become appreciably less since the writ was issued. Moreover, Dominus has incurred some heavy costs, which it does not seem clear that Possessor, although condemned in costs, will entirely defray ; and his triumph is dashed with the reflection that going to law, however pleasing the excitement, is an expensive luxury.

The rooted horror of law, induced by fear of a lawyer's bill, accounts for much of the Englishman's want of acquaintance with legal procedure. He will generally pay any moderate claim made upon him, so long as it does not amount to extortion. If his wife hires a housemaid who turns out badly, the master gets rid of the servant, but pays the month's wages in lieu of notice, although if the servant is in the wrong she is not entitled to them. Sometimes, however, a principle is, or is supposed to be, involved, in which case the

Englishman will do his duty in his family, as he is expected to do it elsewhere. The cook, let us say, gives herself airs; one morning she takes it into her head not to come to family prayers, and when her mistress remonstrates with her, declares it to be her fixed intention not to attend prayers. She gives no reason for her resolve: perhaps she thinks the prayers too long, or too short, or devoid of earnestness, or too unctuous; perhaps she has a philosophical regard for the maxim that "labour is prayer," and prefers to make sure that the breakfast coffee is in good order. At any rate, she declines to come, and Paterfamilias resolves that if so she shall go altogether. His resolution is the more firm as he finds that absence from prayers does not insure perfect coffee. Family prayers to his mind are not only a religious exercise, but a morning parade of the servants, which a reasonable regard for discipline requires. If the servants do not all attend, he may have a servant in his employ for years without even knowing it. He thinks they ought to attend, down to the scullerymaid. Accordingly he dismisses the cook, and this time he declines to give her the month's wages for the time which she has not served. A cook with such independent notions has, of course, friends and advisers outside, and a solicitor of the class ordinarily practising in County Courts is without difficulty found to take the matter up. Paterfamilias receives a polite letter, asking on behalf of his client, Ancilla, the cook, that the month's wages may be paid, together with law charges, or the writer referred to the solicitor of

Paterfamilias who may accept service of a summons in the County Court. It is an odd example of the Englishman's almost superstitious respect for the law, that he will often not only give way on receipt of a lawyer's letter of this kind, but will also pay the lawyer's charges, which the lawyer has not the shadow of right to enforce, but for which he always asks. Paterfamilias, however, on the question of principle is of sterner stuff; he does not care to consult the family solicitor, who, he knows, never goes near a County Court, and he is a little curious to see how the matter will go if left to itself. He, accordingly, writes and asks that the summons may be sent to him, and in due course it arrives. This is how the action of "*Ancilla against Paterfamilias*" comes into existence.

Paterfamilias finds that he does not require to be much of a lawyer to carry his case through. In the County Court there is not, as in the High Court, any of the preliminary skirmishing of pleadings. He finds that the summons kindly tells him in very plain language what he is to do. If the defendant wishes to set up as a defence that she is a married woman, or infancy, or that the statute of limitation has run out, the summons says that notice must be given to the plaintiff. But Paterfamilias only wishes to set up that the cook would not come to prayers, so he leaves things alone, and awaits the day in the next month named for the hearing of the case.

Arrived at the court-house he finds the officials ready enough to give him information. Under their

guidance he first attends the Registrar's room, where he hears "*Ancilla against Paterfamilias*" called out among some hundred others, and is asked whether the claim is disputed. He says that it is, and is told that the case will be heard before the judge. As soon as the judge arrives, he plunges at once into the judgment summonses, which are a most important part of the jurisdiction of County Courts. Until recently the very sound principle of morality that a man ought to pay his debts was enforced by putting the defaulter into prison. If a man has money, he will generally spend it rather than go to prison; and if his friends have money they will, until tired of so doing, come to his help. The power of imprisonment was thus a valuable ally of the creditor, and if the debtor had no money and no friends, the creditor had at least the satisfaction of having his debtor locked up. It was, however, thought that vengeance did not belong to the creditor, and that it was not right to put indirect pressure on his friends. Accordingly, in 1869, imprisonment for debt was abolished, unless it were proved that the debtor had means, but would not pay. As the County Courts are the machinery for collecting a great number of debts which cannot be disputed, the judges are constantly called upon to say whether a man has or has not the means of paying. *Paterfamilias* observes that many of the debtors whose cases are brought before the judge seem to be living very comfortably, but they always explain that they are living with their mother-in-law, or that a kind

uncle supplies their necessities. Imprisonment, therefore, is not ordered very often, and on the whole Paterfamilias thinks that the burden of proof has been thrown on the wrong shoulders, and the debtor ought to prove that he has no means, and not the creditor that he has. What generally happens in a County Court is that the judge breaks the blow of his judgment by allowing the defaulter to satisfy the claim in easy instalments.

The ordinary run of County Court cases follows. There are two little boxes, one on the judge's right and the other on his left, which are occupied respectively by the plaintiff and the defendant. They stand here after the manner of fighting-cocks held in check, and a torrent of vituperation is often exchanged across the table, especially when there are female litigants. A laundress sues for the amount of a washing bill, and the employer resists the claim on the ground that her collars and cuffs have been lost, and her husband's shirt-fronts spoiled by bad ironing. A Jew moneylender sues a clerk in a bank on a bill for £20, which includes interest at sixty per cent. The defendant declares that the Jew knew he was only surety for a fellow clerk, and yet he allowed the other clerk to leave the country without suing him. A baker claims for bread supplied, and the customer affirms that his wife paid the baker's man. An old lady demands compensation for tumbling into a coal-hole left open in the street. The householder says it was not his fault, but the coal-merchant's, whose men left the

coal-plate open. In most of these cases there is a great conflict of evidence, but the judge manages to make up his mind quickly, being guided by the appearance and manner of the witnesses, as their words alone are commonly in direct opposition to those of the witnesses on the other side. Sometimes a jury of five men substituted in the County Court for the traditional twelve is called to the judge's assistance, especially if the case, being too trifling for the higher tribunal, has been sent down to be tried from the High Court; but Paterfamilias observes that jury-trial hardly flourishes in the alien soil of the County Court. The judge is so used to try the facts himself, that he tries them when it is not his but the jury's duty to do so. This is the sort of dialogue that Paterfamilias hears at the end of a jury-case. Judge: "Gentlemen of the jury, the evidence clearly points to a verdict for the Railway Company." Foreman: "The jury find for the plaintiff with £20 damages." Advocate: "I move, sir, for a new trial." Judge: "New trial granted."

The case of "*Ancilla against Paterfamilias*," when called on, does not take long to try. The cook's solicitor details the facts with as much of flourish as he can introduce. Paterfamilias admits them all, and explains that the refusal of the cook to attend prayers was the ground of her dismissal. It would be hazardous to say what the decision of the County Court judge on so weighty a question of domestic

government would or ought to be. Perhaps the judge is epigrammatic, and says that Ancilla was hired "to cook and not to pray," or perhaps he takes a broader view. If the judge is against Paterfamilias he may appeal if he can make out that a question of law is involved. If there is an appeal, the case then gets into the hands of Paterfamilias' solicitor, and is heard before one of the Divisional Courts, which have already been described.

Whatever the condition of knowledge among the Queen's subjects of the working of the law temporal, it could hardly be expected that they should know much of the procedure of the spiritual courts. When lawyers meet clergymen, we may expect something of subtlety and obscurity. Still, the necessities of an era in the history of the Church of England have brought out many instruments of ecclesiastical procedure from their dusty receptacles, and precedents from dark corners of the law blink their eyes in the light of day. If it depended on individuals to put ecclesiastical law in force, the dust and darkness would undoubtedly remain little disturbed. But the Church at that time was divided into High Church and Low Church camps, the one ranging itself under the Church Union, and the other under the Church Association, both being well organised bodies, with funds and energy enough to carry through a suit. The accused in an ecclesiastical suit might generally be assumed to have behind him the former, and the accuser the latter of these organisations.



The main outlines of ecclesiastical procedure are now to be found in the Public Worship Regulation Act, passed in 1874, with a view to simplify the difficulties of the law, which were considered to favour unduly those who at the time were described as introducing "the mass in masquerade" into the Church. Simplicius, let us assume, is an inhabitant of a parish of which Laticlavus has been appointed parson. Laticlavus belongs to the section of the High Church party which are generally called Ritualists. His church has more the outward appearance of a Roman Catholic than an English church. He has a crucifix on the screen, and lighted candles on the altar, and the scent of incense pervades the building. He affects coloured stoles, and wears vestments during the celebration of the Holy Communion, and turns his back on the people in breaking the bread and taking the cup. He mixes water with the wine, and uses wafer bread. These things grate on the feelings of Simplicius and many other parishioners, who consider them inconsistent with the simplicity of worship which they prefer, and to which they have hitherto been used, and suggestive of doctrines not recognised by the Church of England. Laticlavus is appealed to, but he is unable with any loyalty to his principles to alter his practice. Nothing remains but an appeal to the law, and the first step is to represent the grievance of the parishioners to the bishop of the diocese.

The representation is made in the name of

Simplicius and two other parishioners, and is a formal document setting out the heads of complaint. Upon reading this representation it is open to the bishop to decide that further proceedings shall not be taken, but he must give the reasons of his opinion in writing to be solemnly filed in the diocesan registry. In the case in question he thinks there is good ground for complaint, and he sends the representation to the accused parson, and proposes to him and also the complainants a friendly arbitration between them. Neither party is prepared to agree to this course, and the matter is thereupon transmitted to the ecclesiastical judge, whose office was in the Public Worship Regulation Act constituted or rather re-constituted by Parliament. Laticlavus has time given him to answer in writing the charge made, and on the appointed day the judge hears the witnesses which both sides produce, and the arguments of their counsel. He is of opinion that Laticlavus has infringed the law, and issues a monition to him to abstain for the future from the practices which the judge considers illegal. If Laticlavus should not submit to this decision, an order will be made upon him forbidding him to perform service in the church or to exercise the cure of souls for a term of not more than three months. This is by way of punishment for contumacy, and if before the end of the term Laticlavus should not submit in writing, the prohibition is continued indefinitely, and he eventually will lose his living.

But an appeal lies from the decision of the judge

to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and Laticlavius takes advantage of this respite. Ecclesiastical appeals are part of the miscellaneous jurisdiction of this anomalous court of law. Simplicius will find it sitting, not at Westminster or Lincoln's Inn, but in a pleasant and luxurious room, not easily discovered, in the office of the Privy Council, just round the corner of Downing Street. There is a desk for the counsel who is arguing, some seats round a table for others who have business here, and very scanty accommodation for the outside public. The rest of the room, and by far its greater portion, is railed off for the judicial Privy Councillors, who sit scattered about it in comfortable chairs. The place has not the appearance of a court of law, and its ways are not the ways of the ordinary law courts. There is an air of officialism rather than of publicity about it. It is not open half an hour before the sitting begins as is usual with law courts, and the Privy Councillors do not enter the court like judges. But as soon as the Privy Councillors are seated, the doors are opened, and the lawyers and public admitted. When a case has been argued, the profane vulgar are turned out and are recalled, while one of the Privy Councillors delivers their decision, which is not a judgment, but in the form of advice to the Queen. The members of the committee, from time to time, include the Lord Chancellor, the ex-Chancellors, the Chief Justice of England, the Master of the Rolls, the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the Lords Justices, and other judges, who may

have been made Privy Councillors, and certain permanent judges raised from the Bench, either of England or India; but they do not, as in their own courts, deliver each his own judgment; the judgment of the majority is delivered for all, and an expression of dissent is not allowed.

Simplicius has the curiosity to attend the committee before his case is heard. Appeals from the courts of the Queen's dominions abroad are the staple of the business, varied by an occasional half judicial, half administrative case, such as an application for the extension of a patent beyond the usual fourteen years by an inventor who has not reaped so much advantage from it as he ought. Near home, cases come from the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. Rajahs and Zemindars, and Parsee merchants carry their disputes here from India, and find themselves litigants side by side with West Indian planters. The French civil code of Canada has to be interpreted, and a meaning given to the Roman-Dutch law of Ceylon. Australia sends a supply of knotty commercial difficulties, and even the west coast of Africa is not without a share in the arguments. Every quarter of the globe exports litigation to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

A day is specially appointed to hear the appeal of Laticlavus, because there must be ecclesiastical assessors. An archbishop and four bishops support the lay Privy Councillors. On the question of the vestments, the difference between the Ritualists and

their opponents seems to lie in a narrow compass. By the Act of Uniformity, passed in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, it is directed that "the ornaments of the Church, and the ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of King Edward VI., until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, or of the metropolitan of this realm." Both sides admit that in the second year of King Edward VI. vestments were in use by authority of Parliament, but certain "advertisements," or admonitions, were issued by the Queen in 1556 with the advice required by the Act of Uniformity, which provide that "every minister saying public prayers, or ministering the sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves." The Ritualists say that this direction is not an "other order" contemplated by the Act of Uniformity, because it forbids nothing, and only enjoins at least a "comely surplice with sleeves," to which they are entitled to add cope, alb, and chasuble. The Judicial Committee, however, had previously disagreed with this latter view; they in this case maintain their previous decisions, so that the monition to *Laticlavus* is affirmed.

The law and the law courts, as will partly be gathered from the foregoing illustrations of legal administration, are constantly, like other institutions of the country, in a state of transition. The Judicature

Acts concentrated into one Supreme Court the whole judicial staff, which had up to that time been scattered among distinct courts of equal rank, and effected a fusion of the divergent principles which those courts acknowledged, but time was required to reap the full fruits of the reform. The relation between the Supreme Court and the County Courts is among the legal subjects which from time to time occupy the attention of the Legislature, the question being whether the true policy is to strengthen the calibre of the County Court judges, or to put a stop to the transfer of legal business to these lower tribunals, which has been on the increase year by year. Other subjects are canvassed from time to time. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in its colonial as well as its ecclesiastical jurisdiction, has been, in regard to the mode of choosing the judges who are summoned to its deliberations and the conduct of its business, subjected to criticisms which are well enough deserved to portend a modification of some of its anomalies. It is thus evident that the law of England and the law courts are not behind the times, but adapt themselves with as much readiness as the necessarily conservative character of law and lawyers allows to the requirements of the day. A capability of change is perhaps the strongest evidence of vitality.

## CHAPTER XXV.

### THE SERVICES.

Position of the British Navy compared with that of others—Present Importance of Superior Organisation and an Instructed *Personnel*—Training of Boys and Seamen-gunners—Royal Marines—Naval Artificers—Education of Officers—Young Officers of the Present Day—Higher Ranks and Different Branches of the Service—Inner Life of a Man-of-war—Central Administration—Peculiar Independence of the Admiralty—Difficulty of Organically changing the British Army—Efforts at Army Reform—Why the General Outlines of the Army must always remain the same—Chief Changes described within these Outlines—The Abolition of Purchase and Change in the Prospects of Officers—Their Professional Improvements in Recent Years—Short Service—The Formation of the Soldier—Progress of the Recruit—Drill, Discipline, Crimes, Penalties, and Rewards—Insufficiency of Regular Army—Supplemented by Militia and Volunteers—Militia and Volunteers described.

THE relations in which England, as the mistress of a powerful navy, stands to the other maritime Powers of the world are marked by certain peculiarities. Owing to the insular position of the United Kingdom, a fleet is naturally regarded as the first and most important line of defence against aggression. In Continental states, on the other hand, an army affords the best security against the attempts of hostile neighbours. A threat of war turns the thoughts of Englishmen to the condition of the navy, which an enemy must first overcome before he can throw an expedition upon our shores; on the Continent it at once directs attention to the efficiency of the land forces to prevent a violation of the territory.

Most Continental nations will have a neutral state upon some division of their frontier, through which, in the present highly-advanced condition of land communications, trade, though somewhat turned aside from its habitual channels, may still pass unmolested. The external trade of an island must, in the nature of things, be carried on by sea, and only a naval force can guarantee it against blockade. Where, as in our own case, the insular people are their own carriers, the necessity in war to protect private property at sea leads at once to an addition to the functions of the navy. If we add to this the consideration of the vast extent of our transmarine dominions, protected chiefly, if not solely, by the maritime power of the mother country, and the important fact that year by year we are more dependent upon foreign imports for our food—it will be easy to perceive how much more extensive are the duties of our navy than those of the fleets of the other great European Powers.

Progress in the arts and sciences, and the cosmopolitan character of modern commerce, have practically insured to all maritime states an equality in excellence of matériel. If the natural resources of a country do not suffice for, or the skill of its artificers prove unequal to, the production of the ships and equipment now necessary in an efficient fleet, recourse may be had to foreign factories and building-yards. If the money only can be provided, as it, as a rule, seems it can be, any country with a coast may have



at least the inanimate components of a navy. The armour-clad ships of Turkey, for instance, form a squadron only surpassed, in number and quality, by those of two other Powers. The chief superiority of our own country, therefore, lies in the nautical aptitude of the population ; and, as might be expected, to develop this advantage to the fullest extent possible, by the careful organisation and systematic training of the personnel, is a prominent feature of the naval policy of the present day.

Maritime tastes prevail in all classes. To go to sea is, at one time or other, the desire of nearly every English boy. By a politic arrangement the State takes advantage of this wide-spread feeling. Recruits present themselves in greater numbers than are required ; ships can be easily manned ; habits of discipline and a knowledge of the duties that have to be performed are early instilled into the mind of the young sailor ; and hundreds of lads are provided with the means of gaining an honourable livelihood. The advantages which a naval career offers to a boy are sufficiently great to attract to the service the sons of many parents considerably above the lowest class. The limits of age on entering the service—from fifteen to sixteen and a half—and the educational and physical tests are sufficient indication that the boys, for the most part, must have been at decent schools and have been reared in comfort. The prohibition of the enrolment of youths from reformatories and industrial schools guards them against association with crime

and depravity. To the enrolment and engagement to remain in the service for ten years after their eighteenth birthday the consent of their parents is necessary; whilst provision is made for a subsequent change in the family fortunes by permitting the purchase of a discharge on not very onerous terms.

The first step in the boy's career is embarkation on board a stationary training-ship at Portsmouth, or some other southern port. His uniform—supplied at his own cost, but provided for to some extent out of a money grant subsequently awarded for the purpose—is ready for him in a few days, and he soon appears as a small, but veritable, “blue-jacket.” The course of instruction which he has to undergo is elaborate and exact. He begins by learning how to pay respect to his superiors, how to lash up his hammock, and how to fold up and put away his clothes in the sailor's only wardrobe—his bag. His day commences with washing the decks, and his hours of instruction with public prayers conducted by the chaplain. He is taught to wash his clothes, and to keep himself clean in person and neat in outward appearance. Half his time is devoted to regular school work—unless he be qualified for the “upper school,” when the schoolmasters see less of him—and half to instruction in a sailor's duties. Rowing, reefing, furling, rigging, steering, sail-making, are taught him as soon as he has mastered the technical terms of the new language which he will have to speak. Drill with guns, with rifles, and with cutlasses goes on in the intervals

between other lessons. In summer every boy is taught to swim.

The whole course lasts a year, and at the end of it he becomes a "1st class boy," and is sent for a short cruise in the Channel in a training-brig, where he makes his earliest acquaintance with blue water. The schoolmaster and the instructor follow him here; but his time is chiefly and properly taken up in the practical work of his calling. At eighteen he ceases to be a boy, and is officially raised to the rank of a man by being "rated" ordinary seaman. His pay hitherto has been but sixpence and sevenpence a day, which has gone principally to supply clothing and a small allowance of weekly pocket-money. The excellence of the diet in the training-ship frees him from the necessity of spending anything on food. As a man he receives higher pay, is allowed a ration of grog, and may—if so minded—use tobacco. Every man in the navy is practically drilled and instructed until his last day afloat; but compulsory training in the technical sense diminishes considerably with manhood, and ends altogether with the final graduation as able seaman, or A.B.

The importance of excellence in the practice of naval gunnery in modern war-fleets is universally recognised, and has led to the introduction of gunnery-ships, on board which the men who are to become seamen-gunners are carefully instructed. Those who join them do so voluntarily, attracted by additions to their wages in accordance with the class of certifi-

cate gained, and other inducements, such as diminution in the period of service entitling them to a pension. The course lasts several months, and includes drill with great guns, with cutlasses, in musketry firing, in the management of torpedoes, and in the evolutions of infantry and field-artillery. As a fact, all the seamen of the fleet are trained in these things, but the instruction is more thorough and extended in the case of seamen-gunners. A trained sailor may be reefing or furling sails on Monday, acting as a rifleman on Tuesday, manœuvring a field-gun on Wednesday, practising the "cuts and guards" on Thursday, and be working an eighteen-ton-gun on Friday. A gunner must not only be conversant with the practical work of the various branches of naval gunnery, but must be capable of instructing others as well. The most promising men are put through a more advanced course of instruction and become teachers themselves, with the official designation of Instructors. The A.B. answers to the private soldier, and—whether trained in a gunnery-ship or not—can be advanced to higher grades as a petty officer. He may become coxswain of a boat, captain of a top, or boatswain's or gunner's mate, and thus obtain command over others, increased pay, and the right to wear a badge or symbol of rank upon his sleeve; or he may reach the highest position open to a 'fore-mast hand—the grade of boatswain or gunner.

The seamen proper form but a portion of the crew of a ship. There are many other classes "before the

mast." Every vessel carries a considerable detachment of Royal Marines, made up of both artillerymen and infantry, the former being selected from the latter, and subjected to a special training. These men are enlisted on terms somewhat different from those which obtain in the army of the line. They enlist for long service, whilst the men of the army have superior advantages in the way of pay, pension, and promotion from the ranks. Though the requirements in height and chest measurement for the marines exceed those for army recruits, there is never any difficulty in obtaining men; in fact, it has been necessary upon several occasions to raise the standard in order to keep the force within the established strength. The marines are distributed in divisions at the principal naval ports. They supply the guards and sentries on board, and some few of them are permitted to act as servants to the officers. Together with the blue-jackets they man the guns, and in all duties—which do not require their presence aloft or at the oars—they share equally with the sailors. Their training, which, as they enter the service as grown men, is shorter than that of their shipmates, is conducted at their own head-quarters, and is so perfect and carefully supervised that, in spite of long absences from a parade ground, their qualities as soldiers are second to those of none in the world. Their discipline is admirable, and their fidelity so well established as to have almost passed into a proverb. The position of the corps is not so good as its deserts; for, owing to long service enlistment and the require-

ments of the authorities, they form a *corps d'élite*. Of late years, however, the sailor has been more and more trained and drilled as if it were intended that he should be able to perform the duties of a soldier. His military education naturally absorbs a good deal of his time; and it is a common cause of complaint amongst officers of the marines that their men are taken from legitimate duties to perform others and subordinate ones rightly the work of seamen. Besides, there are stokers for the work of the engine-room and stokehole, and endless varieties of artificers. Nor is a crew complete which has not on its lists carpenters, caulkers, shipwrights, blacksmiths, armourers, and painters, each with their separate grades; whilst in large ships are also to be found butchers, tin-smiths, coopers, and lamp-trimmers. Vessels of all classes carry stewards, cooks, sick-berth attendants, and servants.

The officers who have to command these men begin their career at an earlier age than the "foremast hands." To become a naval cadet a boy must be more than twelve and less than thirteen years and a half old. Those who have succeeded in obtaining a cadetship have to pass an examination for school subjects, held twice a year, before they can be appointed to the officers' school-ship, the *Britannia*. It is also necessary to pass an examination in physical qualifications before a board of medical men. The duration of the schooling in the *Britannia* is two years; the cadet being instructed chiefly in the

theoretical subjects, with which he must become conversant before he can gain a correct knowledge of the duties of his profession. The education is to a great extent mathematical, and is almost purely scholastic, in order that the withdrawal of boys at so tender an age from the usual studies of persons of their class in life may be in some measure made up to them. At its conclusion they are sent to the larger of the regular sea-going ships of the fleet, which is the real beginning of the young officer's naval life. His schooling, however, still continues ; the naval instructor—an officer appointed specially for the purpose—claims him for a great part of the day, the desk being really the true scene of the modern midshipman's labours. Examinations are frequent, and future advancement in the service depends on success in them. It will therefore be readily understood from this that the "middies" of the day differ greatly from the "reefers" of Marryat's time. They are school-boys now rather than officers ; purely academic tests being powerful to fix their position in the least academic of services. They still command boats and have charge of tops ; but the former are too often steam launches, and in ironclads the latter are seldom practically used to set or take in sail.

After some four years spent at sea, the passing of a series of examinations entitles the midshipman to his first commission as a sub-lieutenant, and marks the end of the obligatory *status pupillaris*. He may, when promoted to the next rank—that of lieutenant—voluntarily undergo a course of study in naval gunnery, or in torpedo

science; or he can, in any rank bearing a commission, study at the college at Greenwich. But the end of his midshipman's term and its several "final" examinations terminate his schoolboy-days. Promotion to a lieutenancy goes practically by seniority, and should be attained about the twenty-fourth year; to commander, and afterwards to captain, it is by selection; to the various grades of flag-officers, strictly by seniority. A man may be a commander by five-and-thirty or sooner, and a captain four or five years later. Large ships carry an officer of each of these ranks, whilst small vessels with less than about one hundred and fifty men are frequently in sole charge of a commander. Besides the great body of naval officers, there are in the service many branches, *e.g.*, the chaplains, the increasingly important engineers, the medical officers, the paymasters, &c. At least one representative of every class is to be found aboard most men-of-war. Indeed, H.M. ships resemble little worlds in the completeness and variety of the callings which their crews embrace.

It is when the officers and men, of whom so much has now been said, are brought together afloat, that the inner life on board ship may be seen in the customs and manners which prevail throughout the navy. The early and thorough cleansing of every part of the ship, which begins the day; the polishing and beautifying all within and without which follows; the forenoons and afternoons given up to drill and instruction; the busy work of the carpenters,



blacksmiths, sail-makers, and other artificers; the whirr of the lathe of the engineers—all these are reproduced throughout hundreds of ships in all parts of the world. At one time a row of men are standing ready for inspection before having leave or “liberty” to go on shore. At another, a less eager rank is drawn up before the commander, or senior lieutenant (the second in command, by whom the internal economy is supervised), awaiting trial for small offences. Red-coated sentries pace to and fro; the captain quits or returns to the ship amid a shrill flourish of whistles; the doctors inspect their patients in the hospitals, or “sick-bay.” The working hours may be said to end after the early supper of the men at half-past four is finished, when the long-wished-for pipe may be smoked. As the bells strike the hour the watch is called. The pipe of the boatswain’s mate conveys orders given by the ever-present lieutenant of the watch. The whole busy scene of ship life is intended as a preparation for war, and the steady and continuous instruction given has provided the fleet of the country with a class of “trained cutlasses” to which even the “educated bayonets” of Prussia are not superior.

The central government of the naval service resides at the Admiralty, and is carried on by a Board called the Board of Admiralty, the members being styled “Lords Commissioners for Executing the Office of Lord High Admiral.” There are five members of the Board, namely:—The First Lord, who is a member of the Cabinet, and four assistant Commissioners. To the

First Lord is entrusted the general supervision, the control, in great measure, of the naval policy of the country, and the appointment of officers to high commands. His power over his colleagues is practically supreme, but in the division of labour amongst them these important matters as a rule fall to him. Next come three Naval Lords, known as the Senior Naval Lord, Third Lord, and Junior Naval Lord, of whom the first superintends the discipline of the fleet, the Third Lord attends to construction and the dockyards, and the Junior Naval Lord to victualling and transport. The fifth member of the Board is the Civil Lord, who attends to finance. Secretaries take other duties, and the Controller—the greatest officer of the navy who has not a seat at the Board—has care of the matériel and armament.

In the discharge of his important duties he has to approve designs of ships, armoured and unarmoured—from the turret-ship carrying guns weighing eighty tons, and armour twenty-four inches thick, to the gun-boat not much bigger than a Cowes yacht. With his department rests the decision as to the weapons to be carried; the size and position of the guns, and of the new and important weapon—the torpedo. His relations with the dockyards—the vast establishments in which ships are built or repaired—are naturally intimate. The dockyards represent, to some extent, outlying branches of his great department, and have their off-shoots at many places, thousands of miles off, in our colonial dependencies. In the same way the victualling-yards, or

establishments for supplying the fleet with food and other necessities, are distributed about the world. The Admiralty, as head of the navy, enjoys a curious constitutional independence; it can appoint officers independently of the Sovereign's sign-manual; its Mutiny Act—the Naval Discipline Act—does not require renewal. Another peculiarity is the method of voting the estimates. In the army the *number* of men and the charges for pay and maintenance are made the subject of votes. In the navy the *wages* only for so many men and boys are voted. In fact, though many of its privileges have been abolished or exchanged, the Admiralty still occupies a unique position amongst the great departments of the State.\*

The British army of to-day may be compared to an old-fashioned house in one of the principal London thoroughfares, which has been re-fronted and re-decorated to meet the imperious needs of modern progress. Till the portals have been passed no one would recognise the dwelling. Outside, the architect, lavish with plate-glass, with stone mullions and crimson bricks, has worked wonders; but he has not been equally successful within. All his efforts to re-cast the interior of the house and lay it out afresh have been at best half failures. He has thrown down partitions, altered levels, added here and rebuilt there; but his difficulties were

\* The numbers provided for in the last naval estimates are as follows:—For the fleet—Seamen, 34,100; boys, 6,300; marines afloat, 7,000; marines ashore, 7,000. For the coastguard—Afloat (included with fleet); on shore, officers and men, 4,300. Indian service, 1,300. Total, 60,000. Ships and vessels of all sorts, 249.

too great to be completely surmounted, and everywhere the old character of the place crops up irrepressibly. Great structural changes have been impracticable; conflicting interests and vested rights, questions of free access, party-walls and light impeded, have tied his hands. He has been forbidden to increase the limits of the edifice, which must still be contained within its old four walls. Consequently, there are still low ceilings, narrow corridors leading to *culs-de-sac*, curious corners where the daylight cannot penetrate, and where the dust will still gather in spite of new brooms. Nothing better, indeed, could be done, at least until the advent of a general conflagration, an earthquake, or some abnormal cataclysm which, spreading ruin and desolation around, shall leave the site unencumbered for the erection of another mansion, new, from basement to roof-tree, and constructed from first to last on entirely different lines.

It is precisely the same with our army. The necessity for its thorough re-constitution and reform has long been admitted on every side, and statesmen, soldiers, officials, experts of every kind have had a hand to the job. The War Office has proved a sure avenue to the peerage for cabinet ministers, who, recognising the importance of the work, have strenuously put their shoulder to the wheel. A host of specialists, some merely outsiders, others in high place at the War Office and on the staff, have assisted in the work of revision, recommendation, and substitution: yet in spite of the efforts of all, it is only upon the surface, only in its

external aspect, not in its internal framework and principal lines, that the army has been changed.

There are, in fact, certain seemingly inalienable peculiarities which continually run counter to drastic reform. Complications crop up at every turn; grave constitutional and political questions are intimately connected with the whole subject. The responsibilities of the most extensive and varied empire which the world ever knew, intensify a thousandfold the difficulties of army administration and organisation. The usual formula, that liberties are in danger, is echoed on every side at the first hint of the possible necessity for universal service. While parliamentary government remains what it is, the exigencies of "party" warfare will always override the obvious advantages of military efficiency and thorough preparedness for war. The same principle of government carries with it the inevitable consequence that the supreme head of the army must be a civilian statesman. Even if there were not an invincible national repugnance to the mere name of "conscription," the varied character of the service which our soldiers are called upon to perform, often in lethal climates, exiled and at a distance from home, would render compulsory service practically impossible with us. We alone among great European Powers must continue, therefore, to recruit our army by voluntary enlistments, accepting the pecuniary burden which it entails—a tax, however, which ends with the money spent, and does not, as in Germany and elsewhere, seriously sap the

national prosperity and progress. Again, it is this unalterable rule of voluntary service which fixes the quality and status of the men who constitute the rank and file. These cannot, as in countries where all classes alike supply their quota, be drawn from more than one source of supply. This source, with us, must be the market for unskilled labour, in which alone Government competes against other employers for the thews and muscles it requires. Finally, the peculiar fascinations which the profession of arms seems to possess for the sons of the aristocracy and of well-to-do people of the upper and middle classes provide an inexhaustible contingent of candidates for commissions. There is an increase rather than a diminution in the supply, and this in spite of changes which might have been thought to reduce appreciably the attractions of the military career. Notwithstanding the abolition of purchase, the difficulties thrown in the way of exchanges from regiment to regiment to suit individual convenience, and the prospect of stagnation in promotion which can be relieved only at the cost of much hardship, army officers as a body are and will continue to be of the class of gentlemen bred and born.

But although the general outlines and principal conditions of military service remain much what they were a hundred years ago, it cannot be denied that there have been recently great changes and improvements in matters of detail. Of these the most noticeable are (1) the more thorough consolidation of the governing

bodies, which has been effected through the removal of the Horse Guards' staff from Whitehall to the War Office; (2) the abolition of purchase among officers and the concurrent, but not necessarily, consequent increase of professional knowledge and acquirements among them; (3) the complete adoption of the principle of short enlistments for the rank and file; (4) a general careful revision of the training, constitution, equipment, and weapons of the three arms.

I. Before the Crimean campaign there was practically no single great office charged with the administration of the army as a whole. A number of small independent jurisdictions controlled the several branches, working in harmony or not, according to the chances of the case, but imperfectly impressed with their true functions or the importance of maintaining the army itself in a high state of efficiency. The results of this pernicious want of one unified system were plainly apparent in the terrible chaos which promptly supervened during our war with Russia, and one of the first efforts towards reform was in administration. The creation of a new Secretary of State specially appointed "for war" was followed by numerous alterations in names, offices, and business performed, but all having the same object of concentrating authority under one head. The edifice was not crowned until the commander-in-chief was forcibly moved from Whitehall. The Duke of Cambridge had always cheerfully recognised the power and superiority of the Secretary of State as the official

really responsible to the Queen and Parliament; but this subordination continued to be in a measure misunderstood so long as the two remained under different roofs and, at least in appearance, independent of each other. Now the fusion is complete and real. The Secretary of State for War stands next the Sovereign, and holds by delegation the supreme authority and command. Upon his staff are three great officers. Two of these are parliamentary officials having seats in the House, and charged, respectively, with the departments of supply of stores, and finance; the third is the Field-Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, who exercises the purely military functions. The measures by which this consolidation was brought about did not at first find favour with all concerned; but the necessity was indisputable, and now that some six or seven years have elapsed, the system has been accepted and acquiesced in with the best grace in the world. The fact is, the introduction into the War Office of a large leaven of the military element has tended to increase the dignity and influence of the Commander-in-Chief. Clerkdom has in a measure succumbed. The soldiers, although nominally more subordinated, are actually more powerful now when they are on the spot, and their voices can be quickly heard, than when they transacted their business from a distance by communications on paper, or by visits which were formal and rare.

II. The precise aims and objects which the Government of the day had in view when it proposed to abolish the long-established practice of buying and selling



commissions in the army will never perhaps be accurately known. The occasion was one of general excitement, and nothing less than some large scheme of military reorganisation and reform, or the semblance of it, would have satisfied the public mind. Purchase being theoretically quite indefensible, nothing was easier than to charge it with the flaws and failures of the whole system. It was said to impede and interfere with any arrangements for increasing the symmetry and efficiency of the service; the vested rights of the officers stood continually in the way. If a man had purchased his promotion, it was almost impossible to remove him, however incompetent, from regimental command. Merit was repeatedly overlooked; promotion following not fitness, but the length of a man's purse. These and other strong reasons sufficiently justified the attack made upon an institution which might be time-honoured, but which on the face of it had little to recommend it. But they did not easily overbear the opposition which the proposal encountered from the first. There were many practical minds who, while they admitted the disadvantages of purchase, upheld it on grounds of its economy and convenience. It was a system by which a large body of servants of the Crown provided their own pensions without costing the public exchequer a penny. It secured a reasonably rapid flow of promotion; and if, in theory, it bore hardly upon some deserving officers who had not the means to purchase, matters righted themselves in the long run, and, as a matter of fact, they often benefited more

largely by the system than their comrades who paid. For the non-purchase officer who constantly gained promotion by seniority and other means, became entitled to precisely the same sums on retirement as the purchase officer; while the constant movement of men coming and going pushed him steadily to the top of the tree.

Nevertheless, although the contest was fierce and protracted, purchase was definitely swept away in 1871. In the years which have since elapsed there have been many opportunities of testing the wisdom of the change, although it would be premature to pronounce as yet upon its failure or success. Certain consequences, however, which are directly traceable to it have already become plainly apparent. Chief among these is the unsatisfactory conclusion that the eight millions voted to "buy back our army" represents but a fraction of the total outlay involved; promotion almost immediately stagnated, and threatened soon to cease altogether unless some artificial means were devised to quicken it and keep it alive. This entailed an elaborate scheme of retirements with bonuses and pensions which, when in full working order, will fall heavily upon the public purse; while the provisions of the warrant will not improbably prove, in many cases, a distinct hardship to officers themselves. The basis of the new arrangements is that all who, at a certain age, have not ascended above a certain grade shall be compelled to retire. In other words, a captain who is still a captain at forty, a major still a major at

forty-seven, and so on through the various grades, must, although their retardation will probably have been their misfortune and not their fault, take their pensions and retire permanently from active employment. This rule may have been a logical necessity. It cannot be doubted that strong reasons existed why this stagnation should be relieved by application of the scheme to other than the very highest ranks. But the immediate results of the plan will be in many cases hardship to individual officers and to the country at large, a tax for pensions to men still full of health and eager for work. Nor must it be overlooked that the retired military officer forty years of age has but few avenues of employment open to him. It is not easy to forecast the future of the pensioned captains and majors who, with a pittance of a few hundreds a year, are sent adrift from the profession in which they have spent their best years. With an income in itself insufficient, and unless they have fair private means, no other prospects but emigration or genteel poverty, it is already clear that the tendency of the new retirement scheme is decidedly reactionary, and that the army will now less than ever be a profession for poor men.

How far the abolition of purchase can be credited with the recent distinct improvements in the professional efficiency of the body of officers is another point which cannot be exactly determined. No doubt, the knowledge that promotion can no longer be purchased, but may be determined by merit, has proved an incentive to exertion; although even now, it is no

more certain that merit in the abstract will insure advancement, than that incompetence will be a bar to high commands. But other causes have also been at work. The present generation has seen a more widespread development of military science than any which preceded it, and the same influences which brought about German triumphs and French disasters have been indirectly, but yet disproportionately, felt in England. The paramount necessity for progressive improvement has been impressed with irresistible logic upon an important section of our military officers, and these have, in their turn, authoritatively, or by the more effective suasion of precept and personal example, helped to introduce a new tone throughout the service and establish a new order of things. Under the present régime, military subjects are no longer tabooed, as they once were among military men. Military literature finds a wide circle of military readers. Military games are played by the dandified guardsman or the once professionally illiterate dragoon. Schools, classes, lectures in London and the principal garrisons and camps provide all ranks with abundant opportunities for self-improvement, of which numbers gladly avail themselves to the full. This marked and very general change in the ambitions and aptitudes of our military officers is one of the most satisfactory signs for the future of our military institutions. Although yielding to none in the whole world in gallantry and devotion when tried in the hour of supreme danger—it might once have been urged against them that their

scientific acquirements were limited; that, beyond the perfunctory discharge of routine duties, as quickly forgotten as the uniform coat was exchanged for mufti, they had no claim to be called soldiers in the modern sense of the term. But officers now, as a body, are rapidly escaping any such reproach. From the moment the young cadet, released from Sandhurst, matriculates, so to speak, at the *alma mater* of his corps, he is subjected to a system of progress or training which cannot fail to perfect him in the work he has or will have to do. He is still encouraged, as of old, to play games and patronise sport, to shoot, hunt, fish, and show his prowess in those manly exercises which have in times past given English officers a peculiar advantage when sent into the field. He is still constantly reminded by the tone and spirit of those among whom he lives, and who soon become his life-long friends, that unfailing courtesy, a chivalrous bearing and pleasant address, frank manliness, and straightforward and honourable dealings with all the world, are the traits of "the officer and the gentleman." This composite expression appears to be in no immediate danger of alteration. It was thought at the time that the action of recent reforms would tend to lower appreciably the social status of English officers as a whole. But although the expression "Mr. Cardwell's young men" was for a short period often employed as a term of contempt, it had never real meaning or foundation. Now, from causes already indicated, the tendency is more than ever to fill our regiments with

officers drawn exclusively from the moneyed classes. Armies will still be led by the gentlemen of England as of old; but they will be gentlemen who can rely no less on their own professional knowledge than on their personal qualities, to win the esteem and respect of their men.

III. Not less disruptive and drastic in character than the changes introduced in the prospects of officers were the measures adopted about the same time for revising the conditions of service for the rank and file. The Enlistment Act of 1871 was a well-digested scheme for the consolidation of the whole of our military forces. The adoption of the principle of enlistment for short periods of service with the colours, followed by a longer time in a reserve presumably within easy reach, is only of recent date, but it has already modified considerably the aspect and intrinsic value of the army as a whole. Previous to 1870 there had been repeated changes in the terms and conditions of service. Men had been enlisted for life, for twenty-one, for twelve, and last of all for ten years. But none of these systems had aimed to do more than fill the ranks. The recruit who joined under them served always at head-quarters; it was not incumbent upon him, it was not even open to him, to pass into a reserve except under conditions which were not sufficiently attractive to induce him thus to become bound for a further term. The Army Enlistment Act of 1870, which is now in force, was a new and logical attempt to alter this. Under its provisions the recruit is enlisted for either

long or short service. If he chooses the former, the soldier engages to serve twelve years with the colours, and has the option of re-engaging for another term of nine years at the end of the first period. For short service, he engages to serve six years with the colours and six in the reserve; but at any time after three years he may be dismissed to the reserve with a retaining fee in the shape of a modicum of daily pay, which acts as a lien upon him to return and complete the full term should his services under any emergency be urgently required. No doubt, the intentions of the framers of this rule were excellent; and it is but fair to admit that so far as the formation of reserves, which could be promptly utilised and in considerable numbers, is concerned, their endeavours have been crowned with a certain success. The ease and rapidity with which, in spite of friction and small flaws in administrative machinery, these reserves were mobilised when war with Russia was imminent sufficiently established the wisdom of the system in this particular respect. But there are, on the other hand, uncomfortable misgivings that the principle of short service has tended to alter greatly the physical character of the army as a whole, and in a measure to reduce its soldierly efficiency. The reserves, it is to be feared, are kept up at the expense of the service battalions. The latter have become merely feed-pipes, so to speak, a constant stream towards the reservoir of the reserve. The service army is always in a fluid condition; it never crystallises and consolidates

itself. The bronzed and bearded veterans, the old soldiers, full of the cunning of experience, the self-reliant full-grown men who won for Great Britain its records of imperishable fame, are absolutely wanting in our regiments of to-day. That the lads and striplings who have replaced them are animated by the same spirit is probable enough, but they cannot be equal to them in strength and physique, nor are they to be blamed if they exhibit unsteadiness or want of stamina when sorely tried. It is already becoming plain, and the most recent experience in Zululand is a newer and stronger proof of the fact, that some modifications of the principle of short service must be immediately made, so as to secure for every regiment a certain leaven of older men. This may be obtained by offering good non-commissioned officers more substantial inducements to serve on uninterruptedly for a term of twenty-one years; and, secondly, by similar inducements insuring that a certain proportion, say ten per cent., of the rank and file should be composed of old soldiers. \*

IV. But if nowadays our soldiers are merely warriors in embryo, who for the reasons just detailed, can never reach their full development, no pains have been spared to carry their training as far as it can go, to improve their equipment, and generally to

\* A year suffices to teach everything to an infantry soldier in the way of drill, but six years is only enough to *train* him—to give him the military instinct, which is so valuable in a crisis. Why should not reserves be composed partly of men of one year's service, partly of men of twelve; the majority of the men in a regiment being enlisted for twelve years with the colours?



secure their comfort and well-being. The life of the recruit, from the moment he takes the shilling until he is dismissed drill, fully proves this. Whether picked up by the recruiting sergeant in metropolitan purlieus, whether drawn from agricultural district or busy manufacturing town, or whether coming into barracks of his own free will, seeking employment after a run of bad luck in other spheres, the recruit is carefully protected and looked after from the first. He must be sworn in and attested before a magistrate after a certain lapse of hours, to prove that he has not been inveigled into enlistment unawares. To secure his independence still further, he joins his *depôt* or the head-quarters of the corps by himself, and not, as in times past, under an escort. Arrived at barracks, he undergoes a second medical examination, 'is bathed, clothed in fatigue dress, and handed over to his "company" sergeant to be lodged in a barrack-room, made one of a "mess;" and within the day is included in a squad of others like himself about to be initiated into the mysteries of his profession. From the goose step, the infantry recruit passes through the "extension motions" to club-drill, and so on through slow marching, marching in quick and double time, to the use of his weapons, and then to more intricate movements in company and battalion drill, followed last of all by careful instruction in "loose order" fighting or independent skirmishing. The process is naturally more intricate and lengthened with the cavalry recruit, the artilleryman, and the engineer. The riding-school is the prominent feature with the first named, and a

source of no little discomfort to the yokel or city *vaurien*, who has never before been in a saddle. Cavalry exercises, again, are difficult to master because the pupil must learn to handle not a rifle only, but a sword, carbine, pistol, and lance. The gunner's training is never, practically, completed; the horse-artilleryman must learn to ride as well as work his guns, and the garrison gunner has an endless course of instruction in manipulating the multitudinous appliances and machinery of modern ordnance. The sapper or engineer begins with the knowledge of some handicraft or trade, which is an indispensable qualification for enlistment into that arm; but he also has an interminable course of instruction in the various processes which the modern scientific soldier has at command. It is on account of the time and trouble needed to perfect the military education of these several arms that the short service system, as it exists in the infantry, has never yet been extended to the cavalry and the scientific corps.

But the education of the young soldier is not entirely technical and mechanical. While thus undergoing that perpetual repetition of exercises which gradually makes their performance almost automatic, he is insensibly subjected to the influences of discipline, and almost impalpably assimilates those notions of perfect obedience to orders, and implicit subordination of will, which, when thoroughly understood, makes an army, as Locke has it, "a collection of armed men obliged to obey one man." According as he submits

to the iron rule, grudgingly, with a good will, or not at all, must his value as a soldier be measured. If he kick against the pricks, and chafe at the petty despotism of stripling sergeant or callow corporal, who but the day previous was but a recruit like himself, he may enter upon a career of misconduct, which, commencing in trifling *lâches*—such as short absences without leave, occasional resistance to authority—may culminate one day in defiant conduct and desertion of the colours. For each and all of the first named he will have to endure penalties—such as loss of pay and liberty, dull repetitions of drill, with possibly a short confinement to provost cells. If his insubordination go to the length of real violence he will be tried by court-martial, and may find himself in prison for a lengthy term, as he will assuredly do should his desertion end, as it very often but, unhappily, not always ends, in detection and recapture. On the other hand, the well-conducted soldier, save and except for a more or less constant *ennui*, born of the narrow and objectless life he leads, may pass his days in comparative comfort and freedom from care. He is relieved of all responsibilities of maintenance, is fed, lodged, clothed, with the most punctilious attention to his wants and requirements. Officers inspect his food, his barrack-rooms, doctors prescribe for him if his finger aches, he has “his rights,” as he calls them, and may complain whenever he feels aggrieved to the highest authority. The sum of 2d. a day is placed to his credit under the name of deferred pay, so that

when he obtains his discharge he may not be without funds with which to start in his old trade, or on which he can exist till he finds an opening in civil life. But for occasional exile and the somewhat remote responsibility of being called upon to risk his life for his country, the private soldier, in the society of congenial companions, and with just enough exercise to keep himself in health, is perhaps more of a gentleman at large than any other member of the working community.

Were it not for their rawness and crudity, no grave fault could be found with the rank and file of by far the larger portion of our regular army. Our infantry soldiers are armed with an admirable breech-loader, which they are taught to handle with skill and effect. The cavalry are well mounted and fairly equipped, although there is room for improvement still, in weapons and gear, in organisation and tactics, whether for man or horse. As for the artillery and engineers, they may compare with advantage with any in Europe. The intelligence of our officers and their good qualities have been already adverted to, while the action of those in authority and in the superior grades, in raising the level of excellence, is an exceedingly hopeful sign for the future of our army. Yet one serious defect remains, and is likely to remain unremedied until some almost irreparable disaster overtakes us. This is the insufficiency of our regular forces, all told, for the services they may be called upon to perform. What with the demands made by India,

the Crown colonies, and occasional savage wars in possessions beyond the seas, our regular army is always broken up into fractions and distributed over the face of the earth.\* The balance available for service within the United Kingdom, as garrison and safeguard against foreign attack, is altogether inadequate in view of the mammoth armies which our neighbours control; nor is the common explanation that our navy is our first line of defence sufficient to set all doubts at rest. This is plainly shown by our consistent efforts to organise citizen forces to supplement our home army should occasion arise. Of these, the first, the militia, is an institution practically coeval with the nation, which bases its right to exist upon the claim the State has upon every citizen to serve in defence of his hearth and home; the second—the volunteers—is an admirable exponent of the spirit and martial enterprise of the nation at large.

The loyalty of the militia to the State rather than to the individual has always been marked, so much so that at one period of our history it was relied upon as the most effectual safeguard of the liberties of the people against the menace of a standing army. It was recruited by ballot, and though this method has now

\* The army localisation scheme may also require amendment. As matters are, it is only the depôt which is localised, while the regiment is probably never quartered in its district. The mobilisation scheme for home defence is antagonistic to localisation, while a mobilisation scheme for foreign service does not exist. Lastly, when regiments are required to go on foreign service they have, as matters are, to be made up from drafts from possibly half a dozen other regiments.

fallen into abeyance, the statutory power to enforce it still remains. It is perhaps needless to remark that any attempt to carry it into effect would, in the present state of public opinion, lead to determined resistance. Nevertheless, the ballot remains as a last resource in a time of national emergency. Time was when the militia as an element of military strength was somewhat under-estimated. For numbers of years it was never called out, and its existence was almost forgotten. Then after it had done good service, as during the Crimean war and Indian Mutiny, it was long subordinated to the volunteers. It has, however, regained its proper place in public esteem, and is now closely interwoven with the whole scheme of military organisation for purposes of recruiting; militia regiments being affiliated to certain line regiments, to which they act as supports and reserves. More careful supervision and a change in the system of officering, with longer trainings and more frequent practice in association with other troops, have in recent years considerably developed the efficiency of the whole force. As for the volunteers, their wonderful vitality, in spite of snubs and sneers, accompanied not unfrequently by contemptuous distrustfulness as to their real value in time of need, still maintains their prestige. The volunteer movement was the natural outcome of the wave of military enthusiasm which swept over the land in 1859. Many causes had been working upon the national spirit. The Crimean war and the Indian Mutiny had developed rather than

diminished our offensive strength, but it was at the cost of our defensive resources. The militia had been called upon, and had responded well; but even of militia we had too few. It was at this juncture that the apparently aggressive policy of the Emperor Napoleon III. led people to think once more of the proximity of France to our own shores, and gave rise to rumours, intangible enough, but widely circulated and believed, that an invasion of England was not an impossible contingency. There is no doubt that the volunteers were very much in earnest, and, as might have been predicted of the stubborn national character, the only result of the ridicule and satire expended upon them was to intensify their perseverance and confirm their resolution. They are now excellent soldiers, in some points superior to regulars or militia; they are mostly expert marksmen, and they exhibit a high degree of intelligence, being generally recruited from the educated classes. The defective arrangements for their equipment upon a war footing, and for the practice of military exercises, are the great faults of the system. In the present state of our general military organisation, however, it is not quite clear whether, in case of invasion, the volunteers would be much worse off than the regular troops as far as mobilisation is concerned. In any case, it is a great point gained to have the men; and though, with regard to the status of the volunteer force anomalies at present exist which would not be tolerated in Continental armies, it forms an item of our defensive, and presumptively of our

offensive, strength which no Continental critic attempts to ignore. In round numbers the strength of the force is 200,000 men, besides half a million more or less who have passed through its ranks.

In an appendix will be found some information on the subjects of the reserves, the staff, the strength of the army, and the equipments.

---

## APPENDIX.

**THE RESERVES.**—The first-class army reserve is composed of men who have served in the ranks. Short service and voluntary enlistment necessitated an arrangement of this sort. After a minimum service of three years men may pass into the reserve, and are liable to be called out in case of an emergency arising during the period fixed for their service in it. They receive, whilst unembodied, pay at the rate of fourpence a day. The number at which the ultimate strength of the force is to stand has been fixed by the Act of 1870 at 60,000. At present, however, owing to the short time the system has been at work, it is not nearly this strength. In the meantime an attempt has been made to supply its place by the formation of a militia reserve.

**THE STAFF.**—The staff is charged with most important duties. The head-quarter staff at the War Office superintends the whole business of the army. The general staff is composed of picked men who in most instances have passed through the Staff College, where they have received a special training. This rule, however, is not invariable, as good service in the field and recognised ability also open the door to staff employment. In our service the staff system is somewhat complicated, officers being too frequently set to perform duties of ordinary routine, which in Continental



armies would not be regarded as falling within their proper functions.

**MILITARY STRENGTH OF GREAT BRITAIN.**—According to the army estimates for the year ending March 31st, 1879, the regular army of the United Kingdom, exclusive of India, was to consist of 7,199 commissioned officers, 17,199 non-commissioned officers, trumpeters, and drummers, and 111,054 rank and file, or a total of all ranks of 135,452. The proportions of various arms are :—

	Officers.	N.-C. Officers.	Men.
Royal Horse Artillery, including riding establishment ... ..	129	226	2,783
Cavalry, including Household Regiments	621	1,378	10,928
Royal Artillery ... ..	695	1,650	17,085
Royal Engineers ... ..	393	748	4,158
Army Service Corps ... ..	8	500	2,566
Infantry ... ..	3,327	7,021	69,690
Army Hospital Corps ... ..	45	203	1,398
West India Regiments ... ..	102	156	1,580
Colonial Corps ... ..	20	61	566

To these must be added the general and departmental staff, the militia staff, and the staff of the various military institutions, making up the total as above.

The following table recapitulates the various totals :—

	Officers.	N.-C. Officers, Trumpeters, & Drummers.	Rank & File.
Total General and Departmental Staff	1,446	151	—
„ Regiments ... ..	5,340	11,943	110,754
„ Staff of Militia ... ..	298	4,655	—
„ Miscellaneous Staff ... ..	115	450	300
Total regular army, the cost of which is defrayed from the estimates ...	7,199	17,199	111,054

The British army in India for the same year amounted to 62,650 men of all ranks. Further, there are four classes of auxiliary forces :—

Militia ... ..	136,778
Yeomanry ... ..	14,614
Volunteers ... ..	182,810
Reserve, 1st Class ... ..	19,000
„ 2nd Class ... ..	24,000
Total ... ..	377,202

**ARMS EMPLOYED IN INFANTRY, CAVALRY, AND ARTILLERY.—**

The infantry are armed with breech-loading rifles and bayonets. The range of the rifle for practical purposes was estimated at 900 yards, but recent experience has shown that long-range fire, *i.e.*, at much greater distances, will probably be utilised in future wars. Cavalry soldiers are armed with sword and breech-loading carbine, lancers with the lance. The naked weapon or *arme blanche* is the weapon of the mounted cavalry soldier. Dismounted, he can use his carbine with effect. The arm of the artillery is the gun: light field batteries and horse-artillery batteries with muzzle-loading rifled field guns, 9-pounders; heavy field batteries with 16-pounder guns; mountain batteries with steel 7-pounder guns; batteries of position with 40-pounder guns. A proportion of the men are provided with carbines and swords, for individual defence or for outpost and garrison purposes.

## CHAPTER XXVI.

### RELIGIOUS ENGLAND.

Various Religious Sects in England—General Spirit of Toleration—Two Opposite Tendencies in most Creeds: (1) Towards Excessive Organisation, (2) Reaction from Dogmatic Spirit—General Survey of Activity of Church of England—Anglican Theology: its Chief Aspects—Contemporary Aspects contrasted with those of a Former Period—Importance of the Question, whether Theology is Progressive—On the Answer given to this Inquiry, Sectarian Differences depend—Some Tendencies of Broad Church Theology—Dr. Ince—Dean Stanley—Mr. Jowett—Mr. Matthew Arnold—Present Province of Theological Controversy—The High Church and Ritualistic Party: their Differences and Resemblances—The Evangelical Party—Organisation of Church of England—Rectors; Vicars; Perpetual Curates—Great and Small Tithes—The Diocesan System: Bishops; Archdeacons; Deans; Rural Deans—Organisation of Protestant Nonconformists: Independents; Wesleyans—Organisation of the Roman Catholic Church in England—Religious and Social Organisation of the Jews—Common Meeting Ground of all Sects—Future of Religion in England.

IF variety of religious sects were any test of the earnestness of a nation's religious life, nineteenth century England might be esteemed in an enviable condition. The total number of separate denominations having one or more certificated places of worship exceeds one hundred and thirty. These, of course, represent not merely divisions of the same parent faith, and subdivisions, but subdivisions minutely subdivided. In many cases, apparently, the distinction is not so much theological as social or political. Thus Christian Teetotalers are registered independently of the "Temperance Church," while the "Church of Progress" and the "Church of the People" are the

titles of two other mutually separate communions. Scarcely less suggestive than this diversity of nomenclature is the multitude of announcements which are made in the London papers published on Saturday, under the heading "London Preachers for To-morrow." The Establishment itself comprehends a list representing many types of Christianity, churchmen, and preachers. If we look at the intimations which follow the words "Nonconformist Churches," there is no species of Latitudinarianism or Free Thought, whose prophets are not announced to appear in pulpit or on platform. In these cases, not merely is the name of the particular communion given, but of the precise subject on which the speaker may be expected to hold forth. A very cursory glance at the long catalogue will furnish some idea of the extent to which the practical assertion of the principle of individualism in religious matters has been carried. Some of these topics are colourless ethical abstractions. Others testify to different degrees of fanaticism, or fantasy, or anti-Christian and anti-religious malignity. Side by side with the announcement that one evangelist of Nonconformity will treat of the "Life and Times of the Prophet Jeremiah," we are told that an ingenious and speculative schismatic will favour his hearers with the result of his researches in the matter of "Lilith, Adam's first wife," or that another gentleman will lecture on "The Theatre and the People," or that a distinguished astronomer will discourse to an audience on "Meteorites and Shooting

Stars," or that there will be a prelection in some secular conventicle at the East End of London apropos of the inquiry "Ought England to be a Republic?" or that a lady preacher of the school which rejects all that there is in revelation and much that there is in morality, will candidly investigate "whether virtue is compatible with Christianity."

These announcements, which in each case have been taken literally from the newspapers of the day, the name of the preacher and of the chapel alone having been suppressed, will be regarded according to the temper of the critic, either as evidence of the multiplicity of error, or of the praiseworthy activity of the modern mind in declining to take anything for granted, and in not being deterred from the duties of original investigation of the loftiest subjects which can engage the human mind. The age has been variously spoken of as one of religious indifferentism and religious zeal, of generally extended belief, and of wide-spread scepticism. It possesses, no doubt, some of each of these more or less various characteristics. Perhaps its two most real and distinctive features in all that appertains to affairs of spiritual faith are its activity and its toleration. Here, as everywhere in this last quarter of the nineteenth century, are perceptible the different influences of the spirit of transition and of organisation. At the very moment that men are quick to take sides, keen to identify themselves with some phase or other of the religious or irreligious development of the time, they are

disposed to admit that theological truth may reside in an entirely different direction, that truth itself is not to be found in its integrity anywhere, and that scattered elements of truth may be discovered in every quarter. It is not, perhaps, an age in which men would go to the stake with an unshaken conviction that they were sacrificing life for an infallible faith. It is rather an age in which men write pamphlets and essays, promulgate manifestos, and, if necessary, incur law-suits, with the loud-voiced and often-repeated asseveration that they and those who hold with them are, and only can be, in the right. It is an age in which obstinacy is likely to be mistaken for belief, and in which the passion for controversy may sometimes appear a heart-deep devotion to fundamental principles; an age in which enthusiasm does not necessarily mean intensity, and in which fervour is often in an inverse proportion to noise; an age in which all religions are highly organised, but not on that account generally and profoundly believed in; an age of observance, more than conviction, of worship in a greater degree than faith.

A short examination of the existing condition of the Church of England will suffice to explain and justify the views which have just been advanced. The Establishment, it may be perhaps objected, of the religion of a half, possibly of a bare majority, of the people of England, is no longer co-extensive with the Kingdom, and is itself split up into sects many of them differing more widely from each other

than they do respectively from many Roman Catholics and Protestant Nonconformists outside its pale. Still, the Establishment is entitled to be considered as fairly representative of the nation, while above and beyond this is the fact, that the Establishment is a church, and, as such, subject to much the same influences, distracted by nearly the same internal differences and controversies as other churches. Thus the various parties that may be seen in the Anglican communion have their reflections and analogues in the parties which divide Roman Catholicism or Protestant Nonconformity—the difference in the case of the former being that the supreme perfection of its discipline dwarfs or suppresses much that might otherwise be fully developed in openly asserted schism. If the Church of England is tolerant and comprehensive, it is because comprehensiveness and tolerance are the notes of the times, and as is the tendency of the day such is certain to be the spirit of the administration of any particular church. But concurrently with the general attitude of forbearance may be noticed that excessive addiction to organisation, of which mention has already been made. Let us place the two in close juxtaposition, directing our attention first to the latter.

How elaborate is the machinery for guaranteeing the due observance of the Anglican ritual, may be judged from the following statistics. Out of 854 churches within the metropolitan area there is a weekly celebration of the Holy Communion in 390, nearly one-half; daily Holy Communion in 42, one church

in every 20; early Communion in 458, more than one-half; choral celebration in 120, nearly one-seventh; evening Holy Communion in 246, more than one-fourth. There is service on saints' days in 415 churches, nearly one-half; daily service in 243, more than one-fourth; while in 138 cases, nearly one-sixth, there is no week-day service. The service is fully choral in 261 churches, nearly one-third, and partly choral in 240, or two-sevenths, thus giving 501 churches out of 854 where the Psalms are chanted. There is a surpliced choir in 355, more than two-fifths; the choir is paid or partly paid in 220, more than one-fourth, and voluntary in 386, more than two-fifths. Gregorian tones are used wholly or partly in 115, nearly one-seventh. The seats are free and open in 252, more than one-fourth; and there is a weekly offertory in 405, more than one-half. The surplice is worn in preaching in 463, more than one-half. The eucharistic vestments are adopted in 35, or one church in every 24; incense is used in 14, and altar-lights are used in 58, one-ninth; while in 41 other churches there are candles on the altar, but they are not lighted. The eastward position is adopted by the celebrant at the Holy Communion in 179 churches, nearly one-fifth; 123, nearly one-seventh, are open daily for private prayer; floral decorations are introduced at 238, more than one-fourth; the feast of dedication is observed at 149, nearly one-sixth; the shortened form of daily service sanctioned by the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act is used at 88, nearly one-tenth; the Sunday services are separated at 49; the old lectionary is still



used exclusively at 12 churches, and the old and new optionally at six.\*

If to the above statement we add the total expenditure of energy, piety, and good works, which the parochial system of the Church of England involves, if we further remember that larger benefactions are being perpetually made by private persons to the Establishment—that the wealth of the manufacturers of the north of the United Kingdom is often devoted to the building and the endowment of new churches in districts that are supposed to need them, it will be apparent that the zeal which Anglicanism can boast is at its disposal, is very remarkable, both as regards character and degree. It is significant, and it is only just, to place by the side of such facts as these some to which attention is less frequently or less publicly directed. The signs of external activity which the Church of England possesses may be all that are admirable; what is to be said of the evidences of her internal spiritual life? A distinguished living theologian, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, has drawn attention, in an introductory lecture, to the vicissitudes which English theology has experienced. From the Reformation to the middle of the seventeenth century, Dr. Ince remarks, his own university was given up to the disputes between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, or between the Calvinists and the Arminians. From 1650 to 1750,

\* These facts and figures are taken from the thirteenth issue of *Maddison's* "Guide to the Churches of London and its Suburbs," and in this matter London may be regarded as fairly representative of the rest of England.

theology was merged in politics, and the great texts of the pulpit were those which bore on the divine right of kings, and the duty of non-resistance. Then came the struggle about the evidences of Christianity, which was followed by the Tractarian movement. What are the issues now substituted for those which that movement raised? Whereas formerly, the questions discussed in the divinity schools at Oxford were five: "predestination, universal redemption, reprobation, irresistible grace, final preservative," the vexed points now are—incense, lights, vestments, eastward position, wafer bread, mixed chalice.

These, indeed, are not the only subjects which engage the attention of contemporary theologians. The discussion between the most eminent of our theological controversialists is not so much on the doctrines of the English Church as on the nature of the scriptural record. This, it may be urged, involves principles still more momentous than those which underlay the inquiries of an earlier period into the nature of predestination, and the other points enumerated above. For these doctrines can only be verified in the last degree by the testimony of the Bible, to which some would add the concurrent testimony of ecclesiastical tradition. The questions which such theologians as Bishop Lightfoot, Professor Westcott, and Mr. Sanday are endeavouring to decide is of what the really inspired writings consist, and to what exactly inspiration itself amounts. Of course, there are other problems in addition to those mentioned—the

eternity of punishment, and the final restoration of all things. But the tendency is for the more scientific, who in this case are the more practical of theologians, to lay less stress upon these subjects, as admitting possibly of no scientific demonstration, and to weigh all the evidence for and against the alleged antiquity of certain writings, and the degree of authority which they may be regarded as carrying with them. This is the positive and historic method, and in some ways it indicates an immense advance within the pale of the Anglican Church since Dr. Hampden was almost excommunicated for remarking on the obsolescence of the phraseology of the Athanasian Creed, or the authors of "Essays and Reviews" were condemned by Convocation for the production of a blasphemous and heretical book.

What has just been said will enable us to form a better idea of the exact position of the Broad Church party at the present day. It is scarcely too much to state that there is a single question the answer given to which would serve definitely to fix a man's place in relation to the several sects of Anglican Christianity. This question is: Can theology be called a progressive science? According to all the great leaders of the Broad Church party, it can. On this point, hear Dean Stanley:—"What has become of the belief once absolutely universal in Christendom, that unless by some altogether exceptional intervention, no human being could be saved who had not passed through the waters of baptism; that even innocent children, if not

immersed in the font, were doomed to endless perdition? Or where are the interminable questions respecting the doctrine of predestination or the mode of justification which occupied the middle of the sixteenth century in Protestant churches? Into what limbo has passed the terrible conflict between the Burghers and the Anti-Burghers amongst the now United Presbyterians? What do we now hear of the doctrine of the Double Procession, or of the Light on Mount Tabor, which in the ninth century and in the fifteenth, filled the mind of Eastern Christendom? These questions for the time occupied, in these several churches, the whole horizon of theological thought. They are dead and buried; and for us, standing on their graves, it is idle to say that theology has not changed. It has changed. Religion has survived those changes; and this is the historical pledge that it may, that it will survive a thousand more."\* Of course, in one sense, this indicates a real progress, but progress whence and whither? Scarcely from a less belief in the letter of revealed religion to a greater. The dispute now, in fact, is not as it once was about the interpretation of the dogmatic tenets of religion, but about the nature of religion itself. Those who hold by the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of Scripture, and the unbroken tradition of the Church, cannot mean the same thing when they speak of religion, theology, or Christianity, as those who consider that religion is progressive in the

\* "Sermons and Address," by the Dean of Westminster. Macmillan, 1877.

sense already explained, and who admit, as Dr. Ince and others do, that many notions concerning the books of the Bible once deemed orthodox are erroneous. When men do not use the same words in the same sense, it is out of the question that any agreement shall ever be arrived at between them. Thus when Dean Stanley substitutes for the phrase "the reconciliation of theology and religion," "the recognition that so far as they meet, theology and science are one and indivisible," he scarcely signifies by theology all that those who are persuaded that the text of the Bible as we have it, is the precisely written word of Omnipotence signify; or by science, all that to Professor Huxley that word implies. Such expressions as "whatever enlarges our ideas of nature, enlarges our ideas of God;" "whatever is bad theology is bad science;" "whatever is good science is good theology," are open to the same criticism. When, therefore, an analogy is drawn between the progressiveness of astronomy and theology, it must be accepted with some reserve. The historical method of which literary criticism is an integral part has changed—euphemistically speaking—has enlarged, our conception of certain central theological facts, has disposed, as Dean Stanley reminds us, of "untenable interpretations;" "wrong translations;" "mistaken punctuation." But what is the relation in which these instruments of progress stand to the miracles, and other great facts, belief in which is an essential part of Christianity, as Christianity has in time past been understood? Is it not much the same thing

to say that there has been an advance in theology as it would be to say that there has been an advance in astronomy if a convenient compromise had been found possible between those who accepted and those who rejected the idea of the law of gravitation, or of the sphericity of the earth?

Dean Stanley is far from being an extreme illustration of this tendency. The religion of latitudinarianism is not a religion in the same sense as the religion of the High Church or of the Evangelical party. The truth is, that the doctors of the Broad Church school use the current terms of theology in an esoteric sense peculiar to themselves. Thus in a recent sermon Mr. Jowett, the Master of Balliol,\* spoke of the divinity of Christ's life, but he did not mean that Christ was divine. He spoke of the overshadowing providence of God, but he did not mean a personal God. He spoke of a Christian Trinity, but he defined its three elements to be a pantheistic conception of Godhead; all that is Godlike in human life and character, and all well-attested facts of science and history. This is scarcely the Trinity of the divinity schools. Or take the case of the most accomplished literary critic, and almost the greatest poet of the day: Mr. Matthew Arnold. Mr. Arnold is, according to his own view, not only a poet and critic, but a theologian. He has written in defence of the Church of England, as a centre of religious sweetness, light, and culture, against the attacks of political Nonconformists. He

\* Preached at St. Mary's, Oxford, February 16, 1879.

holds that the Church is "a national society for the diffusion of goodness," and, holding this view, he claims to be a very good Churchman. The instruments to be employed by the Church in the attainment of the end of its existence are Christianity and the Bible. But in what sense can Mr. Arnold be said to accept either, when he interprets three fundamental doctrines of Christianity in the following words: "Eternal life? Yes, the life in the higher and undying self of man. Judgment? Yes, the trying, in conscience, of the claims and instigations of the two lives, and the decision between them. Resurrection? Yes, the rising from bondage and transience with the lower life to victory and permanence with the higher. The kingdom of God? Yes, the reign amongst mankind of the higher life. The Christ the Son of God? Yes, the bringer-in and founder of this reign of the higher life, this true kingdom of God."

Of course, these views, or anything approaching to these views, would be conscientiously repudiated by many distinguished members of the Broad Church party. Nevertheless, it may be questioned whether this is not the tendency of all Broad Church theology, and whether the boldly-avowed opinions of Mr. Matthew Arnold do not represent the ultimate analysis of some of the cardinal ideas of ecclesiastical latitudinarianism. As it is the historical method which is chiefly characteristic of the Broad Church party, so, too, there is an historical aspect to the party which is at the opposite pole of contemporary ecclesiasticism—

the Ritualists. For the multitude, it may safely be said, Ritualism is little more than an affair of posture, millinery, music, and decoration. The ground on which the lengths resorted to by Ritualists in each of these matters are defended is, that such extremes are historically justifiable, that they are what the rubric of the Anglican Church enjoins, or that they are what the spiritual rulers of that Church have an historical claim to command. Eminently historical, too, were, in a sense, the influences which presided over the birth of the party that for practical purposes has become merged in the Ritualists. There came up to Oxford, between the years 1820 and 1840, a number of undergraduates, most of whom had been educated under Evangelical influences, and including John Henry Newman, Pusey, Keble, Gresley, Manning, Faber, Froude, Palmer, Perceval, Churton. The avowed object of these men was to withstand all changes, and to maintain pure doctrine and primitive practice. The profession of these views was followed by the study of history. The records of the third century were investigated, the ritual and creed of Rome examined. A sentiment of hostility to the Reformation developed itself. Opinions not held in the third century began to be entertained. Purgatory, prayers for the dead, the confessional, the saints, baptismal regeneration, were regarded with reverence.

The direct descendants of these men, in that state of their belief before these views were carried to their logical results, there still are among us, but the



undoubted tendency is to sink the High Church party in the Ritualists. There can be no greater contrast than that between the religious ceremonial of the first founders of the school and the cultus of contemporary Ritualism. The old type of High Church divine, a scholastic gentleman, well read in the Fathers, and well informed generally on subjects of architecture and archæology, betraying a quiet weakness for anthems and painted glass, a cultivated and agreeable companion, is seldom met with now. The later specimen is a more or less boisterous young divine, much given to the inarticulate mumbling of many services. He is, perhaps, less particular about the cleanliness of his surplice than his predecessor, but is very precise as to the fit of his coloured and embroidered stole. He is fond of speaking in his sermons about the Church, and *her* kindness to *her* ungrateful children. This phraseology is often confusing to the lower classes, and a ballad has been written, which has obtained much popularity, embodying the complaint of an old-fashioned villager at the new style. He used, he says, to understand when he heard of "Christ, our Lord," of "*His* work" and "*His* love;" now, he addresses his clergyman, "you only talk of she." The same person is represented as saying, that no doubt the painted glass windows may be very fine, but then he regrets the days when he could look through the panes upon the blue sky and the climbing roses. The Ritualist curate, or the newly-fledged Ritualist rector, betrays certain resemblances

to those religious sects whom of all others they detest—the Protestant Dissenters—in their occasional disregard for scholarship and culture, and in their invectives against State tyranny.

The Ritualistic divine of this order, who has been known before now to engage the services of a sacristan, to drill his choir in the movements of the Sarum Mass, must be carefully distinguished from the Anglican parish priest, devoted to the spiritual and temporal welfare of his flock, who is to be found constantly at the village school, by the bedside of the sick and dying, in the cottages of the poor and the hovels of the afflicted. Nor while the ringing voice of Canon Liddon thrills through the dome of St. Paul's Cathedral, and while that Cathedral in its Dean, Dr. Church, possesses the scholarlike biographer of Archbishop Anselm, can it be said that the founders of the High Church party are without true and worthy representatives. Essentially anti-popular as the pretensions of Ritualism—or to speak of it by the name which is most convenient in this context, Anglican Sacerdotalism—is, there can be no doubt that it attracts an increasing number of adherents. It is immaterial to the multitude of those who flock to witness the ornate ceremonial of Ritualism, that the theory of these services is, that they are performed by the priest for the people, and that the priesthood thus performing them is a body divinely appointed, a caste by itself gifted with the power of the remission of sins. The exaltation of priestly authority to this point may

be in its idea distasteful to the English people, but it is not with the idea that they are concerned. They are only conscious of the odours of incense, of the brilliance of many-coloured vestures, of melodious notes, of all the influences which can lull or excite the senses. It is a decorative age, and Ritualism is above all things ornamental. It is an emotional age, and Ritualism appeals pre-eminently to the emotions. Ritualism has supplied the want long felt by the æsthetic element in religion, and Ritualism had its beginnings in earnest and pious efforts to secure for the solemnisation of the services of the Church more of dignity and propriety, better fabrics, and better music.

While it is certain that the services of Ritualism attract many of both sexes, who would otherwise have found their place in the Evangelical fold, and that every Ritualistic Church has among its congregation many of that class which would five-and-twenty years ago have crowded to Young Men's Christian Associations, the Evangelical party cannot be said to have ceased to exist. It has, on the contrary, all the elements of vitality—deep religious fervour, an influential religious organisation, a great deal of valuable ecclesiastical patronage exercised through the Simeon Trustees, leaders of recognised ability. Yet of late years the Low Churchmen have lost much of their unction, and much of their exclusiveness. Their influence remains, but it is exercised often quite as much outside as within the limits of their own sectarian pale. The great work with which the names

of the Evangelical leaders will ever be identified was the revival of personal religion; the task which the High Church party helped to accomplish was the introduction of new principles of order and reverence into the services of the Church. There are many points on which clergymen, calling and considering themselves Evangelical, are absolutely one with clergymen of the Broad Church school—such, for instance, as the right of the laity to a voice in the performance of services, and even the regulation and interpretation of dogmas; the necessity of preserving within certain limits the historical method; and other cognate matters. On the other hand, it is natural there should be many evangelical clergymen who, especially as they rise in their profession, are disposed to magnify their apostleship. Hence, in Evangelicalism at the present day there is a tendency, first, on the part of some, to gravitate towards Broad Churchism; secondly, on the part of others, to gravitate to what survives of the old Constitutional High Church party.

First among the parochial clergy rank rectors, who alone are strictly entitled to the designation of parson, "the most legal, the most beneficial, and most honourable title," according to Blackstone, "that a parish priest can enjoy, because such an one as he only is said *vicem sen personam ecclesiæ gerere*." The chief distinction between a rector and a vicar is that the former receives all the tithes, great and small, but the latter usually the small tithes only. It was in the

thirteenth century that vicars came into existence, in consequence of the appropriation of tithes to spiritual corporations, whence at the period of the Reformation they passed, under grants by the Crown, into lay hands. To the great tithes there attaches the obligation of keeping the chancel in repair. Originally, the small tithes were all the tithes, except those of corn, and sometimes of hay. Prior to 1835, no farmer could remove his corn from a field until it had remained there for three days, in order to give time to the rector's agents to take a tenth stalk, unless some special agreement between parishioner and rector had been entered into; and of course, in many cases these agreements were made. Naturally under this system there were many inconveniences and many disputes, which urgently called for reform. In 1835 Lord John Russell passed an Act commuting the average value of the tithes received during the previous seven years into a corresponding annual payment, subject to variations according to the average prices of corn. The freehold of the church, churchyard, and glebe vests in the parson during his life.

Perpetual curates were one of the products of the Restoration, when the Sovereign sent a circular to the bishops and chapters of the different dioceses, pointing out the inadequacy of the provision for the cure of souls. This deficiency was supplied by the institution of perpetual curates, whose stipends were derived from an annual payment which the dignitaries charged on the rectorial estates, in the possession of the fee simple

.

of which the perpetual curate had, of course, no part. In the last fifteen years the very name has well nigh disappeared, and those who were perpetual curates are by Act of Parliament constituted vicars. It is, however, to the poverty of this order that the Church of England is indebted for the institution of one of its funds—that known as Queen Anne's Bounty. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the stipends of the perpetual curates were so miserably low as to be a scandal to the Establishment. Queen Anne, consequently, was induced to suggest to Parliament the appropriation of certain sums, which would in ordinary circumstances have gone to the Crown, to the augmentation of the perpetual curates' stipends. This process has continued uninterruptedly to the present time, and the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty are frequently lending sums of money, to be returned by instalments, to assist clergymen to build and improve parsonage houses. About the same time that the Act was passed for the commutation of tithes, the Ecclesiastical Commission was appointed, which, amongst other things, has been the means of very generally increasing the incomes of Church livings, in cases where they fell below that sum, to £300 a year.

The archdeacons of a diocese are appointed by the bishop, and exercise within their archdeaconries a jurisdiction immediately subordinate to him. They wear shovel hats, similar to those used by the episcopate, but without strings. Etiquette prescribes that

•

he archidiaconal frock coat should not be so short as a prelate's, and that the apron should only be worn in the evening and on state occasions. Like the bishop, the archdeacon has powers distinctly specified by law. Chief amongst these are the prerogative, in virtue of which he can by summoning the clergy create a court. On the occasion of his periodical visitation, the archdeacon is attended by a legal official who stands to him in the same relation that the chancellor does to the bishop. The archdeacon—and if the diocese is extensive there will be more than one incumbent of the office—is above all things the business man of the diocese. As the bishop deals primarily and directly with the clergy, so is the archdeacon specially brought into contact with the churchwardens. The charge which he delivers to the clergy is quite as much intended for the custodians of the fabric of the church in every parish, as for its spiritual officer, the rector, vicar, or curate. Generally, the archdeacon avoids touching in these charges, in any very pronounced manner, on questions of doctrine and dogma. The organisation of a parish, and the conduct of services are both subjects specially proper to the archidiaconal addresses.

When he is inspecting the external and the internal condition of the ecclesiastical building, he has as his companions the two churchwardens, of whom one is the special representative of the congregation just as the other is of the clergyman. To these he points out any defects or imperfections in the edifice, suggests a

remedy, and is empowered to give a written order demanding that this suggestion shall be carried into effect. If this mandate is neglected, he can report the matter to the bishop, but he has himself no power to compel the action which he recommends. The service to the church which a discreetly vigilant and energetic churchwarden may render is great. The race of sleepy and obstinate clergymen and churchwardens is not extinct, and the archdeacon, having a right to inspect the church at all periods, may, by courteously but firmly impressing upon the minds of those responsible for its material order, the necessity of improvement and care, prevent many abuses and scandals. Moreover, both on the occasions of his regular visitations, and at other times in a less formal manner, the archdeacon discharges distinctly educational duties; he makes it his business to explain to all with whom he is brought into contact, what are the ecclesiastical requirements of the law of the State, and how these are affected by successive acts of legislation.

Nor do the functions of the archdeacon end here. Not only is he, as he is often called, "the eye of the bishop," superintending as the episcopal representative indeed, but, at the same time, as an independent authority, whose reports will not necessarily come before the bishop; the state of the ecclesiastical edifices, and pronouncing to the bishop on the fitness of churches for consecration, but he represents the preliminary tribunal which candidates for orders must pass. His sanction also is necessary to give legal validity to the



nomination of those churchwardens with whom, as we have seen, he is mainly brought into contact. At the same time, though, theoretically, it is for the archdeacon to decide the eligibility of any intending clergyman for the Anglican priesthood, this duty is, as a matter of fact, invariably delegated to the bishop's examining chaplain. As regards the churchwardens, the archdeacon formally admits these to their offices and they are regularly sworn in before him.

The cathedral is the central or mother church of the diocese, and is administered by a dean and chapter of canons residentiary, whose number is usually four. The dean, who enjoys the title of "very reverend," and ranks next to the bishop, is appointed by the Crown, except indeed in the dioceses of Wales, where their appointment rests with the bishop. The canons, whose stalls are conferred upon them in theory—and in the present day it must be owned the theory is usually carried out—in recognition of distinguished services or acquirements, usually take it in turn to reside, the period of residence being commonly three months. They are appointed in some cases by the Crown, in others by the bishop, and their incomes vary from £500 to £1,000 a year. The stipend of a dean is seldom less than £1,000 or more than £2,000 a year. While the bishop has direct control over the clergy of his diocese, he has no authority over the dean and chapter of his cathedral, except as visitor under their statutes. There is indeed a special throne always reserved for the bishop in the cathedral, and to this

he, of course, has access ; but he cannot occupy the pulpit except by invitation from the dean and chapter. Generally, the relations existing between the bishop and the dean, to compare them to secular officers, are not unlike those of the admiral and the captain in the navy ; just as the captain is absolutely supreme in his own ship, and the admiral is only entrusted with general responsibility for the movements of the squadron, so the bishop is without the power of dictating to the dean in the management of his cathedral.

The rural dean has not, as the name might be thought to imply, anything in common with the dean of a cathedral. His office and his rights are of courtesy, rather than of law, and he is invested with neither more nor less power than the bishop may choose to give him. He convenes meetings of his clerical brethren for any diocesan work, but his summons carries no kind of compulsion with it. The rural dean will also, probably, occasionally report, though not according to any official form, to his bishop, generally through the archdeacon. While deans and archdeacons are, like the occupants of the episcopal bench, *ex. officio* members of Convocation, rural deans have no such distinction. Their jurisdiction is purely local, each archdeaconry being divided into a certain number of rural deaneries, while of rural deaneries themselves there are altogether in England and Wales about six hundred.

For a brief account of the procedure in matters of

ecclesiastical litigation the reader may be referred to the chapter on the English Law Courts. It remains to say a few words on the subject of the appointment of the different dignitaries of the English Church to their ecclesiastical offices, and on the vexed topic of patronage. An archbishop or bishop is nominally elected in most cases by the dean and chapter of the diocese in virtue of a licence from the Crown, always accompanied by a royal letter missive, which contains the name of the person whom the Sovereign desires to have elected, and to which obedience is due under the penalties of a *præmunire*.

Secondly, as regards the question of patronage. The right of appointing the rector or vicar of a parish rests with the possessor of the advowson, who is termed the patron of the living. The clerk in holy orders who is presented by the patron to a benefice has to obtain from the bishop of the diocese a formal institution, which the bishop is bound to grant, unless the nominee labours under any legal disqualification for the pastoral office. Advowsons are recognised by the law as property, and may be sold like any other property. The next presentation to livings may also be sold, provided the benefice be not vacant at the time, and that no condition as to resignation be a term in the contract. A Commission on Church Patronage, however, is sitting as these sheets are passing through the press, and it has been conjectured that it will recommend amongst other things the abolition of the sale of next presentations.

The two most numerous, influential, and generally important of Nonconformist denominations at the present day in England are undoubtedly the Independents and the Wesleyans, or, as they are frequently called, the Congregationalists and the Methodists. The Independents have many points in common with a third very considerable sect, scarcely inferior to either, both as regards their religious creed and organisation—the Baptists. The Presbyterians, an exceedingly powerful body in England as well as in Scotland, on the other hand, possess more points in common with the followers of Wesley. There still exists at the present day an historical institution of Nonconformity known as the Three Denominations. These form a board whose origin is of some antiquity. The Independents, Baptists, and Presbyterians sympathised in the revolution which placed William III. upon the throne of England, and took an active part in that movement which led to the accession of the House of Hanover. In recognition of their services in connection with these two events, they were accorded the privileges common to bodies incorporated by Royal Charter, and were permitted access to the Sovereign upon the same conditions and occasions as other corporate institutions. Till within the last quarter of a century, there were no sectarian jealousies between the three, and the members of each were content to meet and act together. Then came a change in the Presbyterian community, most of them embracing the principles of Socinianism. The

consequence was that the Independents and the Baptists objected officially to appear in company with Unitarians. Afterwards these last enlisted the services of Lord John Russell on their behalf, and received through him a renewal of the privilege they had before enjoyed as members of the Three Denominations in the matter of approaching the Sovereign.

The Independents are particularly strong in the great towns of England, and are as a body characterised perhaps by the display of more political activity than is usually the case with the Wesleyans or Baptists. Thus it is probable that the Disestablishment agitation has been promoted mainly among the Independent body—a proceeding with which many prominent dissenting clergymen decline to identify themselves. Mr. Dale of Birmingham and Mr. Rogers of Clapham may be regarded as amongst the chiefs of the anti-State Church movement. These gentlemen undoubtedly have great influence over the younger ministers and members of their denomination, and a new impetus is given by them to the programme of the Liberation Society. There are, of course, perhaps possibly in increasing number, strong supporters of Disestablishment both among the Wesleyans and the Baptists, but neither body is associated with political purposes of this kind to the same degree as the Independents. This is not the only feature which distinguishes the Independents. The fundamental principle of their religious creed—a principle which

has given the name to the denomination—is that each congregation is complete in itself, is an entity to be controlled entirely by its own members, and is not to look for any discipline or government from outside. In this respect the Independents and Baptists resemble each other. There is, thus, infinitely less of organisation possible among them than among the Wesleyans, the centre of whose system—whence come the orders that regulate all the parts—is the annually held Conference. The differences of the two bodies will, perhaps, best be understood if we give a brief account of the successive stages through which a candidate for the ministry, in each sect respectively, has to pass.

A young man, we will suppose, born in the Independent body, or entering it in early life, feels that he has a special adaptability for the ministry; what, in the natural course of things, are the steps that he would take completely to qualify himself for the office? He would, probably, in the first instance, place himself in communication with the secretary of one of the colleges at which Independent ministers are educated; but he would not be received at this institution before he had satisfactorily answered questions put to him by its authorities, and had been personally examined by the members of the college council. Having satisfactorily submitted to this ordeal, he would be received on probation for a term of three months, after which he would be admitted as a regular student of a *curriculum* that would extend over four or five years.

Of these the two first would, in some cases, be devoted to supplementing the defects of a somewhat imperfect education, and would be chiefly occupied with general studies, such as classics or mathematics. His earliest purely ministerial training would consist of a course of sermon writing, the discourses thus composed being read before a class, and criticised by a teacher of homiletics. The last three years would be given to the study of theological dogmas, and of the state of religious opinion generally, both in past and present times. Then his ministerial career would actively begin. Having gone through his college course, and satisfied his instructors, he would be considered eligible to accept as a probationer any opportunity of clerical ministrations which might present itself. Should the congregation like him, he will receive an offer of a permanent engagement. He is, in fact, chosen to the pulpit by the plebiscite taken among his flock. No more purely democratic system in an ecclesiastical polity can be imagined. Now that he has secured the favour of a congregation, there will follow his formal ordination, a ceremony which may be profoundly impressive, or entirely the reverse, according to the power and eloquence of the ministers engaged in its celebration. The flock of the future pastor is assembled together, and one minister specially chosen for the occasion gives a statement of the general ecclesiastical principles of the body. Then the candidate for orders is expected, in reply to certain questions, to give a full and clear account, first, of the reasons which make

him wish to enter the ministry ; secondly, of his preference for the Independent form of Protestant Nonconformity. The actual rite of ordination is of extreme simplicity. One of the officiating ministers offers a prayer, during which he and his colleagues place their hands on the head of the candidate. This process is technically known as the laying on of hands by the presbytery, and is maintained by some clergymen of the Church of England, notably by Dean Stanley, to be the true mode of performing the function. In some cases this part of the ceremony is waived. A charge delivered to the new minister follows, in which his duties are pointed out and the solemn responsibility under which he lies for their proper discharge impressed upon him. In a second address the members of his flock are reminded that they have duties, neither less definite nor sacred. Very much the same ceremony is gone through in the case of Baptist and Presbyterian ministers, and if the officiating ministers, on the occasion, are men of considerable gifts, the effect produced is very striking.

Once the minister has been ordained and appointed to his congregation, it is solely and exclusively with his congregation that he is concerned. Where harmony exists between a minister and his church the moral influence he has over them is very great. He will rise or fall, succeed or fail, in proportion as he does or does not happen to satisfy his people. It is thus apparent that the whole success of the Independent system is contingent on a good understanding



between pastor and flock, and it works well or ill, according as the two parties to the contract display both temper and judgment. It does not, however, follow that an Independent congregation will always be able to dismiss its pastor at will. In the case of some chapels there are trust-deeds which specially secure this power of dismissal to the congregation, in others there may be legal difficulties in the way of ejection. The tendency of things amongst the Independent body seems to be in the direction of more concentrated action. There are several eminent Independents who advocate closer bonds of connection between the churches of the denomination, and though this claim is steadily resisted by many staunch members of the society, who believe that without the absolute autonomy of each congregation the Independent system would come to nothing, there is a gradually increasing number of those who hold that more general organisation is wanted, and who advocate particularly a general sustentation fund to be controlled by a presiding representative body. As it is, the Independents have many county associations, from which the Congregational Union, which is the combined society of these associations, is chosen. This Union holds two great meetings every year, one in London, the other in some provincial city of prime importance. Under the existing régime the Congregational Union is a purely consultative and deliberative body. It carries with it no legislative power, and it is, therefore, quite as impotent to change the practice of Congregationalism, except by purely moral influences, as Convocation is

to revolutionise the laws of the Church. There is some disposition, however, to bestow more power upon the Congregational Union, and its exercise may come as the results of its agency in connection with the management of the new sustentation fund.

Nor is it to be supposed that the Independents, or, for the matter of that, the members of any other Non-conformist sect, are entirely undistracted by internal differences and controversies, though they differ from those which agitate the Church of England. Thus, it is a moot point what is the exact position of deacons in an Independent congregation. As matters are, generally, they have no strictly spiritual duties to discharge, their great business is to attend to the pecuniary affairs of a congregation and to the care of the poor. There are, too, slight differences in the forms of worship, and in the mode of admitting communicants. The circumstance that there is in the nature of things a stronger bond between the Independent pastor and his flock than between the English clergyman and his congregation may perhaps tend to minimise such controversies; probably, for instance, there would never be witnessed the spectacle of an Independent minister who deliberately opposed himself to the ascertained wishes and convictions of his congregation. At the same time there are divergences of view as to the limit within which the decorative element is permissible; but these divergences do not involve the same differences of fundamental principle as differences of ritual do in the Church of England,

because all Independents repudiate the idea of sacerdotalism.

When we come to the Wesleyans we have to deal with a Nonconformist body which differs in numerous important matters from the Independents. The great feature of the system is a central organisation invested with a power, not indeed absolutely supreme, but final on appeal; in other words, supreme just as a board of trustees is supreme for the specific provisions of their trust. The name given to this central body is the Conference, whose powers are exercised in (1) jurisdiction over its own members, (2) appointment of ministers, (3) occupancy of chapels by ministers in connection with them, (4) the preservation of sound doctrine. Here it is not merely the tradition of Wesley which discovers itself, but the letter of Wesley's injunctions which is followed. That gifted man who, to his spiritual eminence, added a decided assumption of autocratic power, confided plenary authority over the sect which he had founded in these duties just named, to one hundred ministers. These one hundred form the Conference in law, but the whole body of ministers, or as many of them as are gathered in the annual session, are the Conference in fact—the legal Conference never disannulling their acts, and only confirming them to render them legal. Thus far of purely ecclesiastical matters. In matters economical, financial, and generally administrative, a representative number of ministers and an equal number of laymen constitute the Conference. Hence, the five

score are a sort of upper House, for the ratification of decisions arrived at in common sessions, with a large number of their brethren. It is an error to suppose, as is sometimes stated, that the Conference initiates policy. It rarely initiates anything. Under the general laws by which the whole Conference is governed, there is, first, the circuit, or separate pastorate, in which the chief court is the quarterly meeting, composed of the pastors and a large number, from twenty to sixty, according to the size and influence of the circuit, of lay members. This court manages all circuit funds, pays the minister's stipend, and provides generally for the carrying on of efficient and orderly service within the circuit bounds. Secondly, there is the district meeting, or synod, which is composed of the ministers within a given geographical radius, for purposes connected with ecclesiastical and pastoral administration, and of two lay representatives from each circuit, when financial and economical questions are under consideration. Lastly, there is the Conference, whose constitution has been already described. The Conference—as a Conference—has no funds, nor control of funds. All the pew-rents are under the direction of the trustees of the various chapels, and are by them appropriated—sometimes by grant to the circuit funds, from which the ministers receive their stipends, though not always, and occasionally in other ways. In reference to connectional funds—*i.e.*, funds raised for foreign missions, home missions, schools, &c. &c.—these are disbursed

under the direction of managing committees. Clergymen composing the Conference are elected by the clergy of the entire body, who, in the first instance make their power felt in the district, and after the district in the synod which comprehends a group of districts; but no final action in any grave measure, whatever the congregation it affects, can be taken without the approval of the Conference.

The second great feature in the organisation of Wesleyanism is the itinerant system, in virtue of which no minister is permitted to stay more than three years in the same neighbourhood. There are both obvious advantages and disadvantages bound up with this system. While the limitations imposed by the laws of the society on the possible tenure by the clergyman of a district certainly prevent any congregation from what has been called "immersion in the stagnant pool of a single mind," there is the obvious disadvantage that the minister does not form many pastoral attachments. Though the fact that every congregation is encouraged to issue invitations to ministers is a guarantee of the interest which congregations are likely to take in their purely spiritual affairs, the relation thus developed between teacher and taught necessarily lack certain elements of intimacy, whose absence is recognised by some Wesleyans themselves as an inherent defect in the system.

The unit of government amongst the Wesleyans is the circuit, as represented on the occasion of its quarterly meetings, every circuit consisting of a certain number of

congregations grouped together, both on geographical consideration and also according to number. No candidate can even so far take active steps to enter the Wesleyan ministry as to go to one of the colleges of the body without having been duly recommended by the quarterly meeting of that circuit within which his own congregation comes. At this meeting not only are the local ministers convened, but representatives of the laity, as well as lay helpers and class leaders, who are *ex officio* members of the periodically held assembly. Again, before a young man can even arrive at the stage of candidature, he must have had some practice as a local preacher, and the common voice of his neighbourhood must have decided that he possesses certain indisputable rhetorical gifts. Here we may see what we have seen already in the case of the Independents, the recognition of the principle that the qualifications of a minister must either be decided directly by his flock, or indirectly by their immediate representatives ; we may also notice that this arrangement does furnish, what the Church of England does not, some guarantee that the future minister has, in a measure, the gift of speech.

The candidate for the Wesleyan ministry has no sooner satisfied the requirements of the quarterly meeting of the circuit than he comes before a judicial tribunal composed of representatives of the aggregate of several circuits, in other words the district meeting. Before these judges he has again to preach and to answer a variety of questions. If he satisfies the con-

ditions of this test he is sent before the Conference, whether that august body may happen to be holding its sitting in London or in a provincial town. Should the verdict of the Conference be favourable, the candidate will proceed in due time to the college of the community at Didsbury, or Headingley, or Richmond. At one of these institutions, at which his first three months are probationary, he will probably spend three years, and he will leave them only after he has been pronounced, as the result of a searching examination, to be a fit and proper person for the ministry. Nor is the probationary period of his career yet at an end. Every man remains in the ministry for four years on trial, the third year of college residence which has been already completed counting as one year, while the ordination ceremony, which is practically the same as in the case of the Independents, performed before that period is not considered complete. It is not to be supposed that either among the Independents or the Wesleyans this somewhat elaborate process is always exactly followed. There is nothing to prevent any member of an Independent community who can get a congregation to listen to him or her, to stand as a minister, while amongst the Wesleyans the deficiency of college accommodation frequently compels the Conference to accept as qualified candidates for orders those who have not gone through the whole of the prescribed routine. It thus follows that the future clergy of both orders have scarcely ever lived purely student lives. They have almost always learnt the mysteries of some

handicraft, and are, in the majority of instances, capable of supporting themselves independently of their spiritual profession. Amongst a few Wesleyan societies there exists a pecuniary fund for common purposes; all the pew-rents and voluntary subscriptions within the limits of any circuit are paid into the hands of a trustee steward, who accounts to the trustees for their disbursement. In addition to this, there is a district fund which contributes to the support of circuits in neighbourhoods that are not able to support ministers of their own.

The missionary organisation of the Church of Rome, which is the only organisation of that church existing in the British Empire, is to be carefully distinguished from that known in countries where the whole of the decrees of the Council of Trent are in force. This—the missionary system—is dependent directly on the sacred congregation of Propaganda, presided over by a Cardinal Prefect, to which all matters *in partibus infidelium* are in the last instance referred, and which may be described as a board of control, with jurisdiction over the missionary domains of the Catholic Church.

Previous to 1850, the Papal authority was exercised through vicars apostolic. That year witnessed the establishment of a regular hierarchy in England, and hence the ill-starred Ecclesiastical Titles' Act. At the present moment England is divided into thirteen dioceses, one of which—that of Westminster—is the arch diocese, while the others are suffragan districts.



Every bishop has his own chapter of canons, who are his privy councillors, and possesses the right to convoke his own synod. This canonical body is presided over in England by a provost, and its two chief members are the Canon Theologic and the Canon Penitentiary. These canons constitute a corporate body, electing a certain proportion of their own members, while some are the nominees of the bishop, and others of the Pope, according to the month in which, by the death of a canon, a vacancy occurs. They are also liable to be consulted by the bishop, who, though in some cases bound to seek, does not necessarily follow their advice. Moreover, when a vacancy in a bishopric occurs, the canons name three persons as suitable candidates, the final selection being usually made at Rome. If any of the inferior clergy appeal against the order of their bishop, it is to Rome that that appeal goes. Monsignori are persons belonging to the Papal Court, the more important class of them being the Pope's domestic prelates.

Over and above this regular organisation of the Roman Catholic Church in non-Catholic countries, there are the religious orders, such as Dominicans, Franciscans, Benedictines, Carmelites, Cistercians, and Jesuits. Each of these is in the possession of special and accumulated privileges. Directly subjected to generals or other heads at Rome, they are all of them to a great extent free from the internal ecclesiastical government of the countries in which they may be placed. Each of these orders has a provincial and local superior,

who is invested with ample powers. The Oratorians are not so much an ecclesiastical order as a congregation of secular priests—every priest, it will be understood, being a secular one, if he does not belong to some order—who have organised themselves into a religious community.

As regards the numbers and the influence of the Roman Catholic Church in England, it will be found that so far as the former is concerned, its figures have remained almost the same for many years. Numerically, Roman Catholics have not increased in proportion to the population, to which it stands now in the relation of one-tenth. But while the Church of Rome in England has only managed just to hold its own, it has not retrograded in power. Probably it has as little now of influence as ever over the English middle classes, but it has been recruited in a marked degree from the higher classes of the population; at the same time, too, its organisation has improved. It has more schools and better schools, but in the direction of education much has yet to be done, and the staunchest Roman Catholics will be the first to admit that, always excepting the primary schools, the machinery of Roman Catholic education is at the present moment sadly deficient. The attempted establishment and collapse of a "Catholic University" College in Kensington furnished a test of the reality of the demand for a higher education amongst the Catholic youth of England. As the future of the secondary and higher education of Roman Catholics in England is full

of great possibilities, so its present is felt to be far from satisfactory.

The Jews are a body of far too great importance in England, as elsewhere, to render it possible to dispense with some notice of their religious organisation in this chapter. The Hebrew race, which in the Russian Empire and in Poland numbers five millions, in the Austrian Empire from 120,000 to 180,000, in New York alone more than 100,000, has in the British Empire from 80,000 to 90,000, of whom upwards of 65,000 are within the metropolitan radius of London. On the influence that this extraordinary people exercises, in England as elsewhere, and of which its numerical strength is only a faint indication, it is not necessary to dwell. The questions here to consider are the religious organisation of the Jews in the United Kingdom, and closely allied with this, as is natural under a theocratic system, their social condition and general characteristics.

The same line of cleavage that traverses most other religious societies at the present day is discernible among the members of the Jewish persuasion. On the one hand, there are the representatives of orthodoxy, who profoundly venerate dogmatic tradition and prescription, and who solemnly observe with exact fidelity the ecclesiastical ritual. On the other hand, there is the party of those who claim a wide latitude in the interpretation of the Mosaic law, and who hold that many usages, enjoined by the rabbinical doctors of their church, have been rendered obsolete by the

altered condition of the times. This feud between authority and private judgment has divided the Jews in England into two different groups of congregations. The rabbinical writings, with the doctrinal overgrowth that has been accumulated upon them, a consequence of the labours of successive generations of expositors, are to the Hebrew Church what the Fathers are to the Christian. The laws of Moses have been elaborated in this manner into a complex system of ceremonial and faith, too exacting in its demands for many who are profoundly convinced of the truth of the central articles of Judaism. In this way the Commentary, or to speak of it by its Hebrew name, "The Gemara," has outgrown the text or "Mishna," which two, taken together, constitute the "Talmud." The library of rabbinical interpretation has acquired in some quarters a sanctity equal or superior to the Five Books of Moses, and the point at issue between the two sects at the present day is, what measure of obedience is due to the rabbinical writings. These internal differences in England date from the year 1841, up to which time the English synagogue was an exact copy of that of the Middle Ages. Attempts, indeed, had periodically been made to modify the ritual in a manner suitable to the requirements of the age; but these efforts failed, and it was only when a Reformed English Synagogue was opened in Burton Street that anything was actually done. This movement resulted in an open schism, which was not unattended by much bitterness; the decree of excommunication was

passed upon the new congregation and its minister. Still the heretical leaven spread, and the smaller synagogue was soon exchanged for a larger one. "Though we are," writes Professor Marks, who was at the head of the movement, "still divided on questions purely and wholly ritual, we are nevertheless drawn closely together by a common belief and by mutual sympathies; and for all communal purposes we act as one inseparable brotherhood." It was anticipated by some that the ultimate result of this split in the Jewish community would be the secession of the reformers to the Christian Church. Nothing of the sort has followed, and Judaism has generally revived since the congregation of British Jews was organised. The subdivision of the services, which were, and among the ultra-rabbinical Jews still are, intolerably long, attracts a larger number of worshippers, and the women's galleries, rarely attended in former days, except in high festivals, are now well filled on every Sabbath.

Though the ritual practice of the Jews has always differed at successive epochs, their religious belief is identical in all essential respects with that which has universally prevailed. The Jews, in England as elsewhere, assign the first place in the scale of Biblical sanctity to the Books of Moses, the second to the Prophetical Writings, the last to the other scriptural works—the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Daniel, and historical records—all of which are generally described as "Hagiography." These last are not held to be

inspired in the same sense as the laws of Moses and the messages and predictions of the prophets, which, according to orthodox Judaism, are full of the spirit of verbal inspiration. Mendelssohn remarked that in the whole Mosaic law there was not a single precept saying "Thou shalt believe this or that," or "Thou shalt not believe it," and gave it as his opinion that Judaism was a system without an idea of articles or oaths of religion. Generally the Jews in England, at the present day, are characterised by that spirit of toleration which the remark of Mendelssohn would lead us to expect. As they agree mutually to differ amongst themselves without any reciprocal invocation of the penalties of Divine vengeance, so they hold that salvation belongs to all those outside their own pale who keep the moral law of Moses; in other words, who conform to those ethical sanctions which are recognised as binding by the whole human race. For themselves, they consider it incumbent to observe as much of the ceremonial part of the ritual code of the Pentateuch as is practicable out of Palestine. There is, moreover, a strong feeling amongst them that their marriages should be confined to members of their own race and creed, but the national and the religious sentiments have each of them an independent existence of their own, and they admit that every human being, of every race or creed, who is morally just, stands in the same relation as themselves, here and hereafter, to the Universal Father of man. Even at the time when the storm of persecution raged most fiercely against them the

doctrine was taught that the pious of all nations would enjoy everlasting beatitude in the world to come.

It would be scarcely rash to say that a considerable number of English Jews are simple theists, who, over and above the faith of Theism, believe that the accident of their race places them under an obligation to observe certain rites. They do not hold that these rites are compulsory upon those who are not descendants of Abraham, and for this reason amongst others, the most fervent of Jewish religionists are not proselytisers. Cases in which applications are made to join the Jewish Church are more frequent than might be thought, though probably in few of these can the motive be attributed to disinterested religious conviction. The Rabbi who is importuned to receive Christian converts to the Synagogue protests in the first instance against the step, and says, in so many words, "If you believe in and worship the one and only God, refrain in thought and in deed from idolatry, and keep the moral law, which consists in loving your fellow-creature as yourself, we are taught to believe that you, as a non-Israelite, will be regarded as one with the most pious Jew by Him that readeth all hearts." If after this the applicant persists in the request, and solemnly declares that it is not prompted by any carnal desire or prospect of worldly gain, but is the result of mature and sincere conviction, the Rabbi appoints a term for the religious instruction of the neophyte, and at its expiration reluctantly receives him into the Jewish community.

It may safely be said that the doctrine of the restoration, the ingathering, that is, of the Jews of all nations to Palestine, has no practical reality with them. A spiritual influence over the thoughts of the pious Hebrew it may, perhaps, exercise ; but even in this case it suggests rather the last act in a grand and mysterious drama, an act which will be witnessed only when the present universe is on the eve of dissolution. So far as his actual social and political relations are concerned, the restoration is to the Jew very much what the millennium is to the Christian. Both beliefs, it is to be noticed, had their origin in much the same circumstances of persecution and oppression. As the majority of Christians suffered the cherished doctrine of the millennium to recede into the background when they found themselves in security and power, so most modern Jews, as they rose in the scale of citizenship and prosperity, withdrew their eyes from the belief once firmly held, that their entire race would meet together on the soil of Palestine. As the Jews are thus practically absorbed in the general mass of the English population, or of the population of any other country where they may chance to be, so have the tribal differences amongst the Jews themselves disappeared. Indeed, the only tribe practically known among the English Jews is that of Judah, which, however, includes some of the tribes of Benjamin and Levi. Wherever the name Cohen is found, one may be certain that one has lighted upon a descendant of Aaron.



The distinctly religious organisation of the Jews for the purposes of public worship may be said to proceed upon much the same lines as that of the Independents. In some cases, indeed, the congregations group themselves into a confederation, and recognise, as extending over the whole number, the authority of the Rabbi. Although the Rabbi has no power of enforcing his authority, the congregations placing themselves under his guidance leave to him and his ecclesiastical coadjutors all matters relating to the ritual. This, at least, is the rule. But there are occasions when the wardens and council of a synagogue undertake to introduce changes of a minor character without consulting the Rabbi, and without holding themselves obliged to do so. What portions of the service are to be read, and what chanted, are left to the discretion of the minister in consultation with the wardens. The West London Synagogue of British Jews is the only metropolitan synagogue where there is an organ. In others choirs are formed, but they are not accompanied by instrumental music.

A specially ordained priesthood is what Judaism can hardly be said to have. "Whatever may be urged to the contrary," declares Professor Marks, after having cited a number of historical passages bearing upon the point by those who promote Ecclesiasticism, and to raise above its proper level the seat of priestly authority, the historical fact remains that, from the middle of the eleventh century, all power of authorising teachers in

Israel, by superincumbence of hands, became extinct, and since that time the only recognised authority for electing and instituting ministers has resided in the congregations themselves. There is, however, a special course of education prescribed for the ministers of the Jewish religion, though it is very far from being uniformly followed. In the West London Synagogue of British Jews, over which Professor Marks presides, a special fund has been established for training candidates for the ministry, after they have taken their Bachelor of Arts degree—as it is considered exceedingly desirable they should do, at the University of London—at the theological seminary at Breslau. But, for the most part, the Jewish clergy come from the Jewish College, which has contributed many distinguished graduates to the University of London. Education has advanced with rapid strides among the Jewish community in the last few years, and it may be said with some confidence that there is no child of either sex among English Jews, of the age of nine or ten, who cannot both read and write. The Jews' Free School in Spitalfields provides for the instruction of more than two thousand pupils, half, at least, of whom are of foreign parentage, and there are many other institutions both in London and elsewhere of almost equal excellence. Nor are the provisions that exist for the bodily welfare of the poorer members of the community less effective. There are few instances in which the relief of Jew paupers is left to the ratepayers, and there is amongst the Jews a Board of Guardians chosen

exclusively from the members of their own community, who attend to all cases of distress and administer the funds which are generously contributed. Want and mendicity still prevail, but the latter is almost entirely confined to the foreign Jews, who find their most profitable asylum in England. A great deal of the Jewish pauperism in this country comes to us from Russia, and is the result of a system under which conscription is universal, and no one not professing the creed of Christianity can rise above the ranks. The society which exists in England for the conversion of Jews to Christianity acts, in not a few cases, as an inducement to professional pauperism; nor is there any more common threat with which a Jew beggar supplements his prayer for alms when made to one of the wealthy members of his community, than that, if relief is denied, he will go over to the Conversion Society. Many of the abuses consequent upon the lavishness of Jewish charity have been effectually prevented by the establishment of the Jewish Board of Guardians.

It has been already said, and it may be cited as a proof of the religious activity and earnestness of the age, that the spirit of organisation is visible within the pale of every creed. On all sides there is hurrying to and fro, much parade of the machinery of faith, much insistence upon its routine business, and its spectacular effects. But the question arises, How far all this can rightly be interpreted as a healthy sign? May not the very littleness of the controversies among the members of the Anglican

communion, noticed at the beginning of this chapter, imply a diminution of the vital spirit? The superficial energy is there, but where, it may be asked, are the deep belief and the inspiring convictions which animated the older controversialists? It is unfortunately not to be doubted that excessive organisation is an omen of decay as well as a sign of growth. The excessive organisation of Imperial Rome coincided with the lamentable atrophy of the old Roman spirit. Again, it may be doubted how far the point to which toleration has been carried is at all a proof of that spread of conviction which is likely to result in the diffusion of the distinctively religious sentiment. Toleration may be quite as much a mode of the consciousness of their position, forced in upon the members of any communion or sect by the external forces of literature and science, and by the attitude of the State, as a frame of mind generated by a belief so profound in the truth of their own doctrines that they can regard with complacent indifference the religious movements of others. It is not easy to see how toleration can be innate in any Church party, or how any individual can be tolerant throughout, who is possessed by a sense of the paramount importance of particular dogmatic tenets. What are to be the future relations of the different sects in England, Protestant or Catholic, and what the future of religion itself, is a tempting, but a perilous, theme of speculation. At present we can only see tendencies, and those tendencies are not in the direction

of dogmatic unity. On all sides there is a disposition for the teachers and preachers of different churches to combine together for the purpose of advancing the social and moral good of the community at large; to recognise that element of regard for the progress and amelioration of humanity which belongs to all creeds alike, and which may, perhaps, be spoken of as the human aspect of religion. Thus we find clergymen of the Church of England, of the Church of Rome, of the various Dissenting bodies, taking their place on public platforms by the side not only of devout or philanthropic peers, but also of well-meaning men of the world, who make no special profession of any spiritual faith, with the common object of stamping out the national curse of intemperance. The London City Mission and Hospital Sunday are further instances of the unanimity which is possible among the champions of rival creeds when the object aimed at is the alleviation of human misery, want, and suffering. The institution of School Boards has supplied another and similar opportunity for obliterating denominational distinctions, while the movement now taking place throughout the country, and which has as its purpose the diffusion of art education, also teaches the religious instructors of the masses, irrespective of their faith or sect, to act together with men and women who are, perhaps, attached to no sect at all.

The Positivist, who holds that the only creed possible for humanity is that in which humanity is the first article, may perhaps deduce from these facts signs

of the ultimate triumph of his faith. And it may be urged that there is a sense in which Positivism, as a religious gospel, may not be without its charm to a busy and preoccupied generation; it is conceivable that there are minds to whom it may be an attraction to be told that the sole motive of worthy actions is their inherent worthiness, and that the results of such actions will make themselves felt and will be their own reward, transmitted through endless ages of posterity. Miss Martineau has told us, in her autobiography, that she never felt more completely happy than when she had renounced all belief in a future life and the last traces of a lingering attachment to any theological dogmas. To do good and to cultivate morality because it is a law of enlightened self-interest, and because it will be of advantage to others now and hereafter, is a faith whose large definiteness of outline may have a strong attraction to a certain order of characters. Here there is, at least, none of the doubt and perplexity which overshadow a religion whose sanctions are found in an appeal to the immortality of the soul, and the distribution of rewards and punishments in another world. What has yet to be proved is whether a belief circumscribed by these narrow limits, and divested of all supernatural elements, can have any practical force with the great majority of mankind. If history has any lesson for us, it would surely seem that religion, having survived the calumnies and misrepresentations of sacerdotal bigotry, will survive also the new scientific attacks.

The great question to be asked and answered is this : Can you bring up children so as to make them truthful, moral, law-abiding, good subjects of a State, and good members of a family, without teaching them that there is a God who judges mankind? Here one is irresistibly reminded of the remark of the great French Revolutionist, that if "there were no God, it would be necessary to create one." Of course the answer made to these observations, and which is made with much eloquence and earnestness by Mr. John Morley and others, is that the experiment has not yet been fairly tried. That is undoubtedly true. But the question which these gentlemen have never yet fairly met is, whether in the history of humanity there is anything to justify the belief that a religion of humanity, which ignores all religious sanctions, is practicable for the bulk of human beings, is a categorical imperative without the association of supernatural hopes and fears, likely to accomplish for mankind what even the Positivists say is necessary. Is it merely a fanciful superstition to detect the true account of the growth of human society in these stanzas?—

“ And quickened by the Almighty’s breath,  
And chastened by His rod,  
And taught by angel-visitings,  
At length he sought his God ;

“ And learned to call upon His name,  
And in His faith create  
A household and a fatherland,  
A city and a state.”

## CHAPTER XXVII.

### MODERN PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT.

The Psychological School the Main School of Philosophy in England—Its Relations to the "Scotch Common Sense School," to "French Eclecticism," and to the System of M. Comte and Positivism—Positivism in England—The Course of Development in the English School—John Stuart Mill, the Logician—Utilitarianism—The Modern Scientific Ethics—Herbert Spencer—The Doctrine of Evolution—Alexander Bain, the Psychologist—George Henry Lewes, the Physiologist—Intolerance of Metaphysics and Theology—The Influence of Science and the Popular Consciousness—Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall—The Influence of German Thought—The Hegelians—Reason and Faith, their Possible Reconciliation.

"THE sceptre of Psychology has decidedly returned to England." Such are the words in which Mr. John Stuart Mill sums up the course of recent speculation in this country. Some critics might be disposed to detect some arrogance on the part of the English philosopher towards the psychological studies of Germany, of Kant in the last century, of Herbart, Wundt, Fechner, and Lotze in more recent times. But the sentence quoted above brings into prominence the main fact, which is incontestable: that the best spirit of English thought in this century has, under the leadership of names like Herbert Spencer, Bain, and Mill himself, centred round the problems of mental philosophy. Some activity has indeed been displayed in the deeper and more far-reaching inquiries, which go by the name of metaphysics; but



this has been seen chiefly in the difficult, if not impossible, attempt to transplant German thought to English soil; and the number of the professed adherents of metaphysics may be counted on the fingers of the hand in comparison with the large and devoted band of philosophers who rely on experience. If there is one more decisive note than another of modern English philosophy, it is a resolute adherence to the teaching of experience in mind, matter, and morals.

Such a tendency could not root itself in England without contesting the ground against alien influences; at the beginning of the century there were at least two dominant modes of thought against which it had to struggle. If we put aside for the moment the influence of German speculation—to which we will return later—we shall find two tendencies, one emanating from Scotland, and one due to a form of Continental thought, against both of which, in different ways, it had to make good its ground. That which is known as the Scotch school, under the names of Reid, Dugald Stewart, and Brown, was a philosophy which its adherents called that of Common Sense. The term has either no significance in philosophy, or else it is superfluous. If Common Sense means a tact or instinct, as opposed to experience, it obviously can have no right to exist in a system of thought at all. If it means a rationalised experience, it is only a tautological expression for philosophy itself. As a matter of fact, the school in question arose as a well-meant but merely popular reaction against the sceptical

tendencies of Hume. If philosophy meant such a complete suicide of thought as Hume's conclusions seemed to warrant, the best way appeared to be to abjure philosophical analysis and fall back on broad, uncritical, popular modes of deciding problems. If our knowledge of the world outside, and the soul inside us, was nothing else than a plausible delusion, as it was for Hume, then, inasmuch as ordinary practical men of the world found that they could depend on the world and themselves with tolerable certainty as real existences, it seemed that the fault must lie with the philosopher and not with the objects of his study, and that the best course must be to brush away the cobwebs by a vigorous appeal to common sense. Thus, too, a hand might be stretched to the outraged religious world, scandalised by the notorious scepticism of Hume, and the Scotch successors of a Scotch philosopher might take vengeance on their ingenious but mistaken parent.

This was the historical genesis of Reid and Stewart, and so far as Common Sense meant organised experience, it suited the sober practical temper of Englishmen too well not to leave deep traces on modern English thought. But a philosophy of Common Sense might include other elements. It was almost sure to be declamatory and rhetorical; and sooner or later it would ally itself with that system of spiritualistic philosophy which merges logic into dreams. How little the English psychological school admired the first characteristic may be seen in the

truculent fashion in which James Mill in his "Fragment on Mackintosh" handled that unfortunate rhetorician. How little the second characteristic could be admitted is best seen in the relations of the English school to the French spiritualists. The doctrines of "Common Sense" were soon after their first promulgation introduced into France. Royer-Collard, a disciple of Reid, and his followers Maine de Biran and Victor Cousin, inaugurated a philosophy, which mixed up (in such proportions as the antagonistic elements admitted) Scotch Common Sense, Cartesian self-analysis, and a vague and nebulous spiritualism which was essentially their own. Scraps of thought were introduced from all quarters so long as they would help them in their crusade against their two enemies, Diderot and the Encyclopædists, and Robespierre and Revolution. The result was a marvellous eclecticism, genial, rhetorical, religious, but by no means philosophic, a system which is seen in its best characteristics in the amiable and accomplished M. Jouffroy, some of whose writings have become domesticated in England. But they could not win any sympathy from the English school. The sort of judgment passed on them may be perused in that characteristically English "History of Philosophy" by Mr. George Henry Lewes.

We noticed another influence which the rising school of English psychologists had in a measure to discard. By their very name they held on to psychology as their sheet-anchor. But psychology itself was threatened from a new quarter by a French

thinker, diametrically opposed to Victor Cousin and his fellows—M. Auguste Comte. Comte is the author of that system of strictly practical philosophy and vaguely theoretical religion which is termed Positivism, and Positivism, at all events in the mouth of its earliest expounder, abjures psychology. Psychology, says Comte, is an impossible science, because it attempts to study the faculties by the light of those faculties themselves. "In order to observe you must effect a pause; if you effect the pause there is nothing left to observe." In other words, mind cannot study itself, because that study is only possible by mind's activity, and the activity neutralises the results of the study. The intellect cannot observe the workings of intellect, because here observed and observer are the same. Nor, again, can even the intellect observe the passions, because passion disturbs the observing faculties. And so, instead of psychology, Comte introduces what he calls "Physiological Phrenology," that is, the study of the mind from without, the study of the cerebrum, and the cerebellum, and nerve-centres, and white-grey matter, and the rest of the nomenclature of a genuine physiologist.

That this Positivist attack on psychology had a deep influence on subsequent English thought is clear to all students of Bain, Lewes, Carpenter, and Maudsley; but at the outset it is equally clear that some determined stand had to be made by those who were professedly advocates of psychological analysis. John Stuart Mill has a severe criticism of

this phase of Positivism in his book "Auguste Comte and Positivism," as well as in his "Logic." Herbert Spencer has issued a pamphlet, entitled "Reasons for Dissenting from the Philosophy of M. Comte," in which he asserts that the analysis of our ideas is an integral portion of philosophy. The general line which such criticisms of Comte took is, of course, the obvious fact that even granting that we do not know much of "states of consciousness," we know incomparably more of them than we do of their physical counterparts, and that in the last resort we know no fact at all, except in relation to our own states of consciousness.

But Positivism includes many more essential features than this attack on psychology, which has in fact been greatly modified and almost expunged by modern Positivists. Positivism is at once a system of thought and a system of life. As a system of thought, it proceeds on the fundamental principle that all researches beyond phenomena should be suppressed. First causes and final causes must be discarded; with the beginning and end of things we have nothing to do, our only concern being with what lies between these two extremes. Thus all forms of theology, all forms of metaphysics, are finally banished. As a system of life, it includes a religious cult—the worship of Humanity—and a more or less definite system of Socialism. In France M. Littré is the great modern expounder of Positivism, but of Positivism as a philosophy, not as a

religion ; in England, also, we have a small but devoted band of religious Positivists, of which Dr. Congreve, Mr. Brydges, and Mr. Frederic Harrison are distinguished members. The religious Positivists name their children after mediæval saints, by way of keeping up the catholic feeling of Humanity. They have their own names for the months of the year, and they have their special services in a Positivist chapel in London, in which many curious sightseers serve to swell the ranks of the worshippers of Humanity.

The best and the most permanent element of Positivism was the enunciation of a great historic law of progress and evolution of thought, which in Comte's technical phraseology was called "*La loi des trois états*," but in its general tendency has become merged in the modern scientific doctrine of development. It is this which has, consciously or unconsciously, influenced many English philosophers, who disavow all leanings to Positivism. It is this, possibly, which, combined with the attack on metaphysics, has made Mr. Lewes so strong an advocate of the Positive system. "I adhered," he says, "to the Positive philosophy in 1845, and I adhere to it still (in 1870)." And he would fain have us all read the "*Philosophie Positive*." "Study the '*Philosophie Positive*' for yourself (he thus apostrophises his reader), study it patiently, give it the time and thought you would not grudge to a new science or a new language, and then, whether you accept or reject the system, you will find your mental horizon irrevocably enlarged."

"But six stout volumes!" exclaims the hesitating aspirant. "Well, yes, six volumes requiring to be meditated as well as read. I admit that they 'give pause' in this busy, bustling life of ours; but if you reflect how willingly six separate volumes of philosophy would be read in the course of the year, the undertaking seems less formidable." "No one," he concludes, "who considers the immense importance of a doctrine which will give unity to his life would hesitate to pay a higher price than that of a year's study." Meanwhile, to a less aspiring and more hesitating student, it may be mentioned that in Miss Martineau's excellent "Abridgment of Comte" he can read in the compass of two small volumes the more salient doctrines of Positivism. The importance of the socialistic analysis of that philosophy may be gathered from the fact, that in it will be found the key to Mill's Sociology as sketched in the sixth book of his "Logic," as well as the source and fountain-head of much recent sociological speculation. But in mentioning Mr. Lewes, we are somewhat anticipating the course of development in the prominent English school. His place comes, chronologically, with Mr. Alexander Bain, Mr. Darwin, and others; and to the rise and development of that system of psychological analysis we must now proceed.

How far not only moral and constitutional peculiarities, but modes and forms of thought can be transmitted from father to son, is one of the much debated questions of heredity. But that the two Mills—father

and son—exhibit a striking instance of the extent of such hereditary transmission is indisputable. The mind of John Stuart Mill was run in the mould of James Mill, and the creations of that mind were but more or less varied repetitions of the thoughts of the bold and original historian of British India. The proofs are to be found not only in the general position of philosophic radicalism which is common to both, but in the edition which the son published of his father's "Analysis of the Human Mind," and in the explicit admissions which are contained in that book—of such peculiar sadness to many minds—the "Autobiography of J. S. Mill." This book has thrown much light on the character of his philosophy. It has explained how it was that his psychology was so entirely derived from that of James Mill, and was the result of so little independent study on his own part; it has explained why Mill never seems to have systematically studied Continental philosophy, especially German speculation; it gives the reason for his being so wholly occupied with the middle levels of thought, to the exclusion of all inquiries as to ultimate ideas, and the beginning and end of things. For we now know that his education left hardly any room for his character and disposition to display any preferences, and that he was trained strictly on the lines of Benthamism in morals, and a modernised version of Hobbes in mental philosophy. A stern, rigid, autocratic father like James Mill, with clearly defined views, rendered all the more positive and dogmatic by opposition and unpopularity, was not



likely to allow his son's intellect to expand in any other directions than such as accorded with his own predilections.

There is little which may be called strictly original in Mill's philosophical scheme, except, possibly, in some of his logical speculations. To him must be attributed a theory of reasoning, which, if not wholly new, yet exhibits with clearness and precision the function of the major premiss in a syllogism, and affirms that our course of reasoning is not, as is usually supposed, from the general law to the particular case, but, without exception, from particular case to adjacent particular cases,—the major premiss being but a memorandum, a compendious statement of the result of our experience hitherto. If to this we add that he is the author of certain experimental methods or canons of induction (which have been severely criticised, among others by Dr. Whewell)—that he advocates the existence of “Real Kinds” in nature apart from classifications due to our own convenience—that he has illustrated with great amplitude the plurality of causes and intermixture of effects which are found in nature's working, we shall have exhausted his chief contributions to logical science. The most interesting part of his “Logic” is the sixth book in the second volume, in which Mill, starting from psychology, and what he terms “Ethology” (*i.e.*, the conditions which regulate the varieties of human character), proceeds to trace the future science of Sociology. It is in this department of his work that he approximates most

nearly to the work of Comte and Positivism, just as it was especially his sociological structure which formed the most valuable and lasting influence of M. Comte on his successors.

In the fundamental doctrines of his philosophy, as exhibited, for instance, in his bitter attack on Sir William Hamilton, Mill appears as a modern version of Hume. He is like the elder philosopher in his empirical and sensationalist stand-point, believing that the whole body of human knowledge may be traced back to sensations, to immediate contact with the world outside us, entirely excluding *à priori* mental action. He is like him, again, in his attack on so-called necessary and universal truth, resolving, for instance, all mathematical axioms into the mere result of a number of experiences of points, straight lines, and angles. Above all, he is like him in his analysis of external matter, which he concludes to be nothing but the "permanent possibility of sensation," and, with some limitations, extends the same analysis also to the case of mind. But in his more purely psychological aspect, Mill's merit lies in the clear stress which he has laid on the great principle enunciated by Hartley of "the association of ideas." Resemblance and contiguity in our ideas cause them to be so indissolubly welded together, that we find it impossible to call up one without thereby summoning the others in its train. It is thus that we associate together, for instance, our notion of "straight lines," and "impossibility to include a space," and end by imagining—so indissoluble

is the connection thus formed—that we have this union of the two ideas as an intuitive perception of our minds, independent of all experience. It is thus, too, that association of antecedent and consequent in the natural world leads to the idea that there is in what we term “the cause” some productive force, some creative energy, to which the effect is due; and again, in less theoretic spheres, it is thus that the notions of money and happiness are so blended together, that the miser will make the amassing of money his end, finding happiness in such a confusion of ends and means. In fact, “the association of ideas” is a sort of “mental chymistry,” as Mill calls it, which explains many of the most deeply-rooted convictions of our nature; and in psychological science we are told that it plays much the same part as the law of gravitation does in physics.

More important, however, in its influence on contemporary and popular thought than his more purely philosophic speculations was that doctrine of utilitarianism in morals, of which, under the influence of his father and Bentham, Mill was so energetic an advocate. Indeed, the belief that the good is only the generally useful is, in one shape or another, common to the whole of the so-called English psychological school, to Herbert Spencer and to Bain just as much as to Mill himself. In still later times Mr. H. Sidgwick, of Cambridge, has published a work on “The Methods of Ethics,” in which he appears as the defender of the utilitarian theory: and it may

be said that, for the greater part of the thinking world, as well as for a large section of the unthinking, utilitarianism forms the popular philosophy of the day. It has been found to accord marvellously well with the practical temper of the English mind, and receives more than an incidental illustration in the favourite English study of political economy.

There are many points of view from which utilitarianism appears to give a satisfactory explanation of the phenomena. When we approach human action from the political side, the utilitarian view is perhaps the only practicable one. The happiness of the people is the only possible aim for the political philosopher; indeed, it has been often urged, sometimes as praise, sometimes as blame, that the principle of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" has more a political than a moral character. Helvetius says "*La science de la morale n'est autre chose que la science de la législation.*" And for this, there is this sufficient reason that utilitarianism studies only the consequences of action (*i.e.*, action viewed from the outside, as it affects other people), which is a truly political and social view. The question, however, remains, whether if personal ethics is to mean anything, it should not mean "action viewed from within," in connection, that is, with the principle and motive which animates it. Or again, in cases of casuistry, or instances where apparent duties clash, it may be asked what better test can be found than experience of the consequences of actions? When a patriot has to decide between

his duty to the Government under which he lives and his duty to his own views and aspirations for his country, is not "utility," or the greatest happiness of the greatest number, the best solvent of his doubts? On the other hand, though an appeal to utility can best settle collisions of duties, it is clear enough that there are virtues, the sacred and authoritative character of which is taken away by the explanation afforded by utilitarianism. Justice is very clumsily explained (notwithstanding Mill's discussion in his "Utilitarianism"); Chastity, Veracity, Honesty, are more powerful before the analysis into utility is applied to them than after it. A man will not consent to be killed rather than tell a lie because, on the whole, the practice of telling truth is useful to humanity, nor yet will a Light Brigade charge Russian guns because military discipline is good for the world.

The fact is that, despite the extensive popularity of utilitarianism among English modern philosophers, it runs counter to that popular consciousness, to which it is sometimes given to break through the cobwebs of metaphysical ingenuity. Nothing is more clear to unsophisticated minds than the distinction between what is expedient and what is right, however often they may happen to coincide. We do not venerate the man who, when called to some act of heroism, calculates whether on the whole his act will be useful to himself and to the world, or not. It is more natural to call self-sacrifice noble, than to call it useful; and no martyr—not even a scientific martyr—would ever

go to the stake, if he stopped to reckon up the benefits to society as against the personal pain of a death by burning.

Whether utilitarianism, however, is satisfactory or not, it is at least an attempt to explain moral phenomena as forming an independent science of their own. The analysis given of conscience by Mill, although it denies its primary and original character, yet derives it from certain sentiments and feelings, which are apparently disinterested. But the latest tendency of philosophy in England is to make morality a sort of appanage of physical constitution, and to define conscience as a "function of organisation." The characteristic of Bain and Lewes as psychologists is (as we shall see) to treat thought as a function of matter, and from this it is but a step to the position that all moral feeling and sentiment may be equally explained by physical considerations. The step has been boldly taken by some physiologists and medical theorists, amongst others by Dr. Maudsley. In a lecture on Conscience published in his work "Body and Mind," Dr. Maudsley says, "There is the strongest desire evinced, and the most strenuous efforts are made in many quarters to exempt from physical researches the highest functions of mind, and particularly the so-called moral sense and the will. The moral sense is, indeed, the stronghold of those who have made strategical movements of retreat from other defensive positions which they have taken up. Are we then, as physiologists, to allow an exemption from

physical research to any function of mind, however exalted? or shall we maintain through good and through evil report that all its functions from the lowest to the highest are equally functions of organisation? A vital question for us as medical physiologists, which we must sooner or later face boldly and answer distinctly." To which we may add, that it is also a vital question for moral philosophers which they must face boldly and answer distinctly, if there is to be any longer an independent science of ethics.

Dr. Maudsley proceeds to ask if there is "the same essential connection between moral sense and brain which there is between thought and brain, or between any of our special senses and its special ganglionic centre in the brain?" To which he returns an emphatic affirmative, with the assertion that they do not admit of any other scientific interpretation. "One thing is certain, that moral philosophy cannot penetrate the hidden springs of feeling and impulse; they lie deeper than it can reach, for they lie in the physical constitution of the individual, and, going still farther back, perhaps in his organic antecedents. Because the fathers have eaten sour grapes, therefore it often is that the children's teeth are set on edge. Assuredly of some criminals, as of some insane persons, it may be truly said that they are born, not made; they go criminal, as the insane go mad, because they cannot help it; a stronger power than they can counteract has given the bias of their being." A striking illustration is adduced to bring this home to the reader. "While

the Reign of Terror was going on during the first French Revolution, an innkeeper profited by the critical situation in which many nobles of his commune found themselves, to decoy them into his house, where he was believed to have robbed and murdered them. His daughter, having quarrelled with him, denounced him to the authorities, who put him on his trial, but he escaped conviction from lack of proof. She committed suicide subsequently. One of her brothers had nearly murdered her on one occasion with a knife, and another brother hanged himself. Her sister was epileptic, imbecile, and paroxysmally violent. Her daughter, in whom the degenerate line approached extinction, became completely deranged, and was sent to an asylum. Here then is the sort of pedigree which we really want if we are to judge of the worth of a family—the hereditary line of its vices, virtues, and diseases.”

<i>First Generation.</i>	Acute intelligence, with murder and robbery.		} Absence or destruction of moral sense.
<i>Second Generation.</i>	Suicide.	Homicidal violence and suicide.	
<i>Third Generation.</i>	Mania.		Epilepsy, imbecility, and mania.

Such is the latest result of the application of the great modern doctrine of “Evolution” to the phenomena of moral life.

The first systematic adoption of evolution, as the keystone of philosophy, was made by Herbert Spencer. Of the three contemporaries, Herbert Spencer, Alexander Bain, and George Henry Lewes, who have propagated so widely the scientific and philosophic impulse commu-



nicated by Mill, it is undoubtedly the first who completely merits the name of a systematic thinker. In March, 1860, a catholic scheme was propounded, almost Titanic in its proportions, of works to be issued in periodical parts by Herbert Spencer. The series was to begin with "First Principles," with its two divisions of "the Unknowable" and "the Knowable," to proceed to "The Principles of Biology" in two volumes, "The Principles of Psychology" also in two volumes, "The Principles of Sociology" in three volumes, and to end with the two volumes of "The Principles of Morality," and of this enormous programme the greater portion is completed. Little wonder is it that Mill and Lewes should be equally emphatic in their admiration. In comparing him with Comte, Mill says, "Mr. Spencer is one of the small number of persons who by the solidity and encyclopedical character of their knowledge and their power of co-ordination and concatenation, may claim to be the peers of M. Comte, and entitled to a vote in the estimation of him." "It is questionable," says the author of the "History of Philosophy," "whether any thinker of finer calibre has appeared in our country, although the future alone can determine the position he is to assume in history. . . . He alone of British thinkers has organised a system of philosophy." The reason is that Herbert Spencer's philosophy is dominated by one vast conception, which serves as a focus in which are gathered and concentrated all the rays of thought in its different departments. It is saturated with one thought of

pre-eminent importance—the great conception of “Evolution,” of “Development.” As Professor Huxley has said, “The only complete and methodical exposition known to me of the theory of evolution is to be found in Herbert Spencer’s ‘System of Philosophy,’ a work that should be carefully studied by those who desire to become acquainted with the tendencies of scientific thought.”

What is this law of evolution? We must first attempt to get some scientific expression or definition of it before proceeding to observe its exemplifications in the different spheres of being and thought. It has one fundamental principle from which everything is deduced—the persistence of force. Just for the reason that energy is always active in nature, that force never fails or dies, do things in nature change, adopt new forms, new developments, new transformations. If the law is to be expressed in a formula, it will run thus: “Progress consists in the passage from a homogeneous to a heterogeneous structure.” The law of all progress is one and the same, the evolution of the simple into the complex by successive differentiations. If we ask why progress should run always in this direction, from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, the reason is twofold. In the first place, if a body is in a homogeneous condition, it is unstable; “homogeneity is a condition of unstable equilibrium;” or in more simple language, a state of uniformity is one which cannot be maintained. A familiar illustration is furnished by the scales, “If they be accurately made and not clogged by

dirt or rust, it is impossible to keep a pair of scales perfectly balanced; eventually one scale will descend and the other ascend, they will assume a heterogeneous relation." Or again, "Take a piece of red-hot matter, and however evenly heated it may at first be, it will quickly cease to be so, the exterior cooling faster than the interior will become different in temperature from it, and the lapse into heterogeneity of temperature so obvious in this extreme case takes place more or less in all cases."\* The second reason for this direction of progress is that every active force produces more than one change, every cause produces more than one effect. The multiplicity of effects resulting from a single cause naturally converts homogeneity into heterogeneity. If a body is shattered by violent collision, "besides the change of the homogeneous mass into a heterogeneous group of scattered fragments, there is a change of the homogeneous momentum into a group of momenta, heterogeneous in both amounts and directions." "Of the sun's rays, issuing from him on every side, some few strike the moon, these being reflected at all angles from the moon's surface, some few of them strike the earth. By a like process the few which reach the earth are again diffused through surrounding space; and on each occasion, such portions of the rays as are absorbed instead of reflected, undergo refractions that equally destroy their parallelism." For these two reasons—

\* Herbert Spencer, "First Principles," p. 402. The interested reader should study the whole of the chaps. xii.—xviii. of Part II., exhibited in more popular form in "Essays," London, 1861.

that homogeneity is a condition of unstable equilibrium, and that every active force produces several changes—the law of evolution may be defined as a process during which “an indefinite incoherent homogeneity is transformed into a definite coherent heterogeneity.”

Herbert Spencer illustrates this law with a wonderful wealth of illustration in all kinds of different spheres—in the sphere of the world's growth, the growth of individual organisms, the growth of the social organism, and the genesis of science; of these we may select the first and the third as adequate examples of Spencer's method.

In the beginning geologists tell us that our globe was a mass of matter in a state of fusion, and was therefore of homogeneous structure and of tolerably homogeneous temperature. Then came the successive changes into heterogeneity; into mountains, continents, seas, igneous rocks, sedimentary strata, metallic veins. Or, again, look at the case of organisms on the face of the globe. Fishes are the most homogeneous in their structure, and are one of the earliest productions on the globe; reptiles come later and are more heterogeneous; mammals and birds, which are produced later still, are still more heterogeneous; man is the most heterogeneous of all. Even if we limit ourselves to the case of man, the law holds good. The multiplication of races, and the splitting up of races among themselves, have made the species much more heterogeneous. “The Papuan has very small legs, resembling in this the quadrumanous kind, while in the case of

the European, whose legs are longer and more massive, there is more heterogeneity between the upper and lower limbs." Another example of this progress in heterogeneity is furnished by the subdivisions even of the Saxon race, which has within a few generations developed into the Anglo-American variety and the Anglo-Australian variety. Perhaps, however, a still clearer example of the operation of the law can be found in the development of the social organism. The society of savages is an aggregate of individuals, who all hunt, fish, go to war, and work, or in other words, it is homogeneous; every individual having the same functions. Then comes a differentiation between the governing and the governed; while in the governing power are still united religious and executive functions. Other differentiations lead to our present condition of heterogeneity, Church gradually dividing itself from State, and the actual political organisation consisting of numerous subdivisions in justice and finance, in executive and deliberative powers.

In Herbert Spencer's "Principles of Psychology" the same law is applied to our mental states, and we are proved to have become in mind what we are by successive developments from early organic states. A striking result of the introduction of this conception of evolution into psychology is shown in Herbert Spencer's attitude towards the so-called "Forms" of mind. There are certain forms, of which "Time" and "Space" are most frequently quoted, which have been the sources of

much mental confusion to philosophers, for they seem to be so entirely innate, conceptions of such immediate validity, as to preclude all possibility of resolution; and hence by Kant they have been boldly termed "Forms of Sense," or, in other words, *à priori* conditions of sensation and perception. On the other hand, they can be resolved, and are resolved by philosophers like Hume and Mill, into ideas "put together out of successive single sensations." Now this old difficulty as to whether "Time" and "Space" are *à priori* or *à posteriori*, is solved according to Herbert Spencer by the hypothesis that they are in reality *à priori* to the individual, but *à posteriori* to the race; in other words, men begin *now* in their perceptions with ideas of space and time ready formed; but these have in reality been bequeathed to them—bequeathed by a long course of experiences in their ancestors. And so Herbert Spencer claims to have reconciled Locke and Kant: "in psychology, the arrested growth recommences now that the disciples of Kant and those of Locke have both their views recognised in the theory that organised experiences produce forms of thought."

Nothing, in fact, is sacred from the penetrative analysis of this philosopher; no thought, no feeling, no sentiment, not even that sentiment which, under the name of Love, has formed the staple commodity of poets and novelists. This is how "victorious analysis" disposes of love. "The passion which unites the sexes is habitually spoken of as though it were a simple feeling; whereas it is the most compound, and *therefore*

the most powerful of all the feelings. Added to the purely physical elements of it, are first to be noticed those highly complex impressions produced by personal beauty; around which are aggregated a variety of pleasurable ideas, not in themselves amatory, but which have an organised relation to the amatory feeling. With this there is united the complex sentiment which we term affection—a sentiment which, as it can exist between those of the same sex, must be regarded as an independent sentiment, but one which is here greatly exalted. Then there is the sentiment of admiration, respect, or reverence; in itself one of considerable power, and which in this relation becomes in a high degree active. There comes next the feeling called love of approbation. To be preferred above all the world, and that by one admired beyond all others, is to have the love of approbation gratified in a degree passing every previous experience; especially as there is added that indirect gratification of it, which results from the preference being witnessed by unconcerned persons. Further, the allied emotion of self-esteem comes into play. To have succeeded in gaining such attachment from, and sway over, another, is a proof of power which cannot fail agreeably to excite the *amour propre*. Yet again the proprietary feeling has its share in the general activity; there is the pleasure of possession—the two belong to each other. Once more, the relation allows of an extended liberty of action. Finally, there is the exaltation of the sympathies. Thus, around the physical feeling forming

the nucleus of the whole are gathered the feelings produced by personal beauty, that constituting simple attachment, those of reverence, of love of approbation, of self-esteem, of property, of love of freedom, of sympathy. These, all greatly exalted, and severally tending to reflect their excitements on one another, unite to form the mental state we call 'love,' and as each of them is itself comprehensive of multitudinous states of consciousness, we may say that this passion fuses into one immense aggregate most of the elementary excitations of which we are capable; and that hence results its irresistible power."

And now what has Herbert Spencer to say of those deeper problems which lie at the root of philosophy and science, of the relations of all the forces and powers of nature to the First Cause—of the relations of science and religion? One of the most interesting portions of "First Principles" treats expressly of these problems. Herbert Spencer asserts that he has found a reconciliation between religion and science. The reconciliation is, possibly, not one which either of the two contending parties would accept; and more strangely still, it is a solution framed on the lines of Sir W. Hamilton and Dr. Mansel—the one a Scotch metaphysician, the other a "Bampton lecturer" on divinity. Both religion and science must allow, according to Spencer, that ultimately they rest on "the Unknowable." The theologians cannot define their God, cannot possibly explain how an infinite and an absolute can yet be a



Person; the scientific men cannot define the ultimate grounds on which rest their "Forces," and "Energies," and "Laws." In every direction, if we pursue the inquiry long enough, we come to an inner secret, to a substratum of "the Unknowable." "By continually seeking to know, and being continually thrown back with a deepened conviction of the impossibility of knowing, we may keep alive the consciousness that it is alike our highest wisdom and our highest duty to regard that through which all things exist as the Unknowable."

As "Amurath an Amurath succeeds," so follow psychologists and physiologists in the steps of Herbert Spencer. Among these, two have raised themselves into the front rank—Alexander Bain and George Henry Lewes; but their merits are of a very different order. By far the acuter mind of the two, both in speculative insight and the special talents of the psychologist, was possessed by Mr. Lewes. Without him, it would be true to say that a marked step of progress would be wanting in philosophy. But such praise could hardly be accorded to Mr. Bain. His strength lies rather in expression, in illustration of details, in general breadth of descriptive power, rather than in those gifts of vivid insight, or ample generalisation, or pregnant suggestion, which form the character of an original philosopher. Perhaps such a man is needed after a great systematic, synthetic thinker like Herbert Spencer, to pick up, as it were, the fragments that remain, to bring out points in clearer light which

might otherwise be neglected, to serve up the intellectual banquet anew in fresh forms for the jaded appetite. Necessary, however, though such a man may be in a series or succession of philosophic thinkers, yet from a popular point of view—from the view of large or widespread influence on the body of the cultured world—we shall hardly be wrong in passing over without much comment the name of Mr. Bain in such a general review of thought as we propose to ourselves. One reason, amongst many others, which might be adduced of the comparative unimportance of this philosopher is to be found in this: that there is in his work, as his French critic, M. Ribot, observes, “a too frequent absence of the idea of progress, and a consequent neglect of the dynamic study of phenomena.”

The best that can be said for him will be found in the estimate of J. S. Mill, in an essay published in the “Dissertations and Discussions.” “He has worthily inscribed his name beside those of the successive builders of an edifice, to which Hartley, Brown, and James Mill have contributed their share of toil.” But in that temple of fame we presume that niches are found not only for the master-builders, the great spiritual architects, but also for those who have humbler tasks, the careful and conscientious workmen in other people’s designs. By far a truer estimate, probably, is that given by Herbert Spencer in one of his “Essays.” “The work of Mr. Alexander Bain is not in itself a system of mental philosophy, properly so called, but a

classified collection of materials for that system, presented with that method and insight which scientific discipline generates, and accompanied with occasional passages of an analytical character. Were we to say that the researches of the naturalist who collects and dissects and describes species, bear the same relation to the researches of the comparative anatomist, tracing out the laws of organisation, which Mr. Bain's labours bear to the labours of the abstract psychologist, we should be going somewhat too far, for Mr. Bain's work is not wholly descriptive. Still, however, such an analogy conveys the best general conception of what he has done, and serves most clearly to indicate its needfulness."

The chief points of interest in Mr. Bain's philosophy may be briefly summed. In the first place, we notice the same stress on the physiological antecedents of psychology which is to be found in Herbert Spencer. In the first of his two larger books, "The Senses and the Intellect," Mr. Bain begins with a description of the brain, the cerebral nerves, the cerebellum, and the spinal cord. The nervous system is for him the "*fons et origo*" of psychological study, for the nervous system is the very condition of psychological life. In a word, the life of the mind is but a special variety, a peculiar manifestation, of general physical life. In the second place, we have in the same work an elaborate study of the association of ideas, illustrated with that fulness of descriptive power which is the best and the chief characteristic of Mr. Bain. Lastly, in the companion

work, entitled "The Emotions and the Will," we have an exhaustive enumeration (yet hardly a classification) of the feelings and emotions, studied in their double aspect, as parts at once of psychology and physiology. Somewhat curiously, English philosophers have, as a rule, been deficient in any study of the emotions. They have not in this respect assimilated one of the truest elements of Comte's programme (which distinctly included "the affective phenomena"), and the result has been a certain unreality and lack of practical influence in their mental theories. Yet, though Mr. Bain does his best in this instance to fill the breach, his descriptive power too often runs away with him; according to the judgment of Herbert Spencer, in Mr. Bain's work description fills too large a share, and analysis too small a one. It is only a strict analysis which can precede a real classification.

Very striking, suggestive, and original are the contributions made by Mr. George Henry Lewes to the history of modern thought. Metaphysics Mr. Lewes will have none of, and his attack on them in his later books is only an echo of the attack made in the *Prolegomena* to the earliest edition of his "History of Philosophy." If we wish to see Mr. Lewes at his best we should peruse that characteristic Introduction. There will be found the salient features of his style—its liveliness, its freedom from all pedantry, its critical acumen, its popular sallies, its excessive dogmatism. The metaphysician and the man of science are like two travellers who come into

a country where they meet for the first time with a clock. One finds in the new phenomenon an exhibition of a vital principle: "the ticking resembles the regular sounds of breathing; the beating of the pendulum is like the beating of the heart; the slow movements of the hands, are they not movements of feelers in search of food? the striking of the hours, are they not cries of pain or expressions of anger?" The other traveller is aware of the necessity of verifying hypotheses, and proceeds according to a different method. He takes away the face of the clock, but finds nothing changed, but no sooner has he stopped the pendulum than he finds that everything has stopped with it. From these and other experiments, he discovers truly that the clock is a mechanism. Such, thinks Mr. Lewes, is the difference between the two classes of minds, one of which is doomed to sterility, the other ordained to an ever-increasing triumph. Or again, "the metaphysician is a merchant, who speculates boldly, but without that convertible capital which can enable him to meet his engagements. The man of science is also a venture-some merchant, but one fully alive to the necessity of solid capital, which can, on emergency, be produced to meet his bills; he knows the risks he runs whenever that amount of capital is exceeded; he knows that bankruptcy awaits him, if capital be not forthcoming." A third illustration is drawn from the phenomena of spirit-rapping. With such variety of agreeable matter does the brilliant historian of philosophy beguile the ennui of the student, and attempt to disguise the

difficulties which surround that unique phenomenon "Consciousness."

There is, perhaps, only one thing which moves Mr. Lewes' scorn as much as metaphysics, and that is dogmatic theology. "The expansion of knowledge is loosening the very earth clutched by the roots of creeds and churches," he says with almost cruel energy. The history of philosophy is for him the narrative of the emancipation of philosophy from theology. In time, he hopes, we shall be in possession of "a method which will make religion also the expression of experience, and thus dissipate the clouds of mystery and incredibility which have so long concealed the clear heavens." Whether the Positivist "Religion of Humanity" be "the expression of experience" is best known to the hierophants initiated in those mystic rites: but that this is not what religion means to the ordinary consciousness is obvious. Possibly, here we have one result of that definition of philosophy which makes it equivalent to analytic science. In his special lines, Mr. Lewes' criticism is always pertinent, his judgment clear, and his conclusion expressed with unmistakable emphasis. As an historian of philosophy he has his favourites, and he lets his readers know clearly who they are. Any genuine analytical power, however imperfect in exercise, he always admires; which explains, perhaps, why he is so singularly indulgent to Bishop Berkeley, and why he is filled with such true respect for the critical work of Kant. But meaningless dialectic he abhors and despises: and

next to his scathing criticism of the French eclectics, we may put his merciless and (if the truth may be said) somewhat inadequate treatment of Hegel. As a psychologist, he has developed, in independent lines, the system of Herbert Spencer, and has completely severed himself from all affinity with the simple sensationalism of Condillac.

In company with Mr. Lewes, but not, perhaps, equally deserving of the name of philosophers, come a host of writers, mainly scientific, amongst whom we may specify the names of Darwin, Carpenter, Maudsley, Morell, Sully, and as pure savants, Tyndall and Huxley. Of these, probably, Darwin has had most influence in fashioning, or at least instigating, popular modes of thought and expression. "The Origin of Species," "The Descent of Man," "The Expression of the Emotions," have probably been more widely read than usually falls to the lot of scientific books. For so long as savants labour in the special departments of science, public opinion is excessively tolerant, for the simple reason that its incuriousness is only equalled by its ignorance; but as soon as the field of minute inquiry is left behind, and some wide generalisation is attempted, some startling law exhibited, which touches the general thoughts and feelings of the common mass, then at once public opinion gets aroused and angry, and ignorance degenerates into something very akin to blind bigotry. This is a mere matter of history, and does not affect either way the truth or the untruth of the opinions that have aroused the storm. As long as

Darwin studied the phenomena of the world of pigeons, or threw new light on the question of instinct, he was left alone in his study to pursue his scientific experiments; but when, as a result of these experiments, there came forth the great law of the evolution of the human race from lower organisations by means of the "Struggle for Existence" and the "Survival of the Fittest," mankind, perhaps naturally, resented a theory which established their kinship with a lower creation. The same was the case in a lesser degree with Professor Tyndall. He might pursue his science and his pleasure in the Alps as long as he liked, but when he propounded a theory about the origin of things in a Belfast address, the popular consciousness felt itself injured in its belief in the Book of Genesis. For there are two subjects with which ordinary human nature will not permit any liberties to be taken—its origin and its decease; it pursues with relentless hatred materialists and Positivists, professors of evolution, and deniers of the soul's immortality; and in quite recent days Professor Hæckel, of Jena, has stirred up this opposition anew. In the wild but virtuous indignation of "the organs of public opinion," some ignorance may possibly be detected of what "a scientific hypothesis" really means, some convenient forgetfulness that the methods of inquiry which make them so angry are precisely those which have taught us the facts of astronomy, and won for us the material comforts of our civilisation. But the historian cannot overlook the fact that these struggles to and fro, these heart-burnings, these contentions



between the Church and the laboratory, religion and science, are but so many indications of the profound unrest of modern thought, varying and antagonistic elements, which prove, as clearly as they can, the transitional character of our age. The lines of the reconstruction can hardly yet be guessed—whether the issue is to be an armed neutrality between religion and science, and a clear division of territory between them, or the triumph of science and experience, or, as some think not improbable, the renascence of religion in the form of a philosophy. Whichever it be, one thing is clear, that these scientific conceptions of evolution, of development, of analysis, of biology, have gained and are gaining an increasing hold on the modern world. We find them in our newspapers, in our magazines, in our poetry, in our novels; analysis, triumphant and victorious, is seen on every page of Browning's verse, in every paragraph of George Eliot's latest novels. A hero is not drawn in some flash of constructive genius, as he would be in a great creative age like that of Shakespeare, but built up, piece by piece, by single traits and characteristics, amidst a mass of reflections, after the manner of a critical, analytic, transitional age like that which is the parent of Daniel Derondas. The very word "evolution" has lost its scientific meaning, and we now talk of the evolution of a plot in a three-volume novel. Whether the future be with the Darwins or Huxleys we know not, but it is abundantly clear that the present is on their side. To deplore the fact is as useless as to ignore it; it is to

condemn ourselves to hopeless sterility. "Toute cause qui haït son temps se suicide." More interesting and more profitable it is to attempt to see how the future, with its wondrous power of reconciling contraries, will assimilate scientific conclusions with that vast body of pre-existent popular thought, which science may be said as yet to have scarcely leavened.

One element in such a reconciliation must undoubtedly be furnished by the influence on England of German thought. This influence we have reserved to the last, because its reality and permanence have often been unjustly questioned, and because no candid historian can help allowing the fact that it is in itself alien to the English temper and English modes of thought. Somewhat fitful, in fact, and spasmodic has been in England the German invasion of ideas. In quite recent times we may discriminate between two periods of this influence—the first of which may be said to have already passed away, and the second to be but just beginning. English reliance on science and experience has, of course, continuously allied itself with the empirical philosophers of Germany, but the deeper thoughts and the metaphysical systems of the one country have had to wait upon the appearances of somewhat rare spirits in the other, before they could become known and, for the time at least, naturalised. One such rare spirit was found in Samuel Taylor Coleridge, born in 1772. In 1798 he went for some time to Germany to study the philosophy of Kant. In 1817 and 1825 he poured forth upon the English

public his earnest protests against the philosophy which was popular among them, in his "Biographia Literaria" and his "Aids to Reflection." In one aspect, possibly, he might be called reactionary, for he was full of the times of Elizabeth and James, and the greatest period of English literature; but in another aspect he was the prophet, seeing from a mountain the land which the common herd had not the wit to see, ever warning men against the philosophical writers of his time, ever striving to awaken some feeling for, and belief in, the systems of Jacobi, and Schelling, and Fichte, always insisting on a distinction which was strange to the English intelligence—that between reason and understanding—for reason to Coleridge was the organ of the higher truths, understanding a faculty on a lower scale, a faculty of comprehension, but not, like the other, a faculty of creative thought. The impulse was widely extended by a literary feeling. The literature of Germany—Goethe, and Lessing, and Schiller—was popularised for the first time in England by the labours of Edward Bulwer Lytton, Thomas de Quincey, and above all, Thomas Carlyle. The last is a unique figure in the literary world, passionate, masterful, bizarre, penetrated through and through with German thought, an idealist, a poet of the highest type, a great creative genius, a "laudator temporis acti," a modern Heraclitus, σκοτεινὸς, αἰνικτῆς, ὀχλολόιδωρος. To him and to Coleridge more than to any other writers, we owe whatever German elements are to be found in our ordinary thoughts. To him was due that naturalisation

of Kant, which was brought about by Hamilton, Mansel, and perhaps Whewell. But already his influence is waning, and he is no longer to the younger generation of the present day what he was to the contemporaries of De Quincey.

The latest phase of German influence is literally a resurrection of metaphysics under the influence of Hegel. Some such reaction was historically necessary after the exclusive reign of science, and ardent spirits are possibly inclined somewhat to anticipate its rise. Yet that after a due submission to autocratic "experience," and an obedient relegation of metaphysics to the limbo of morbid idiosyncrasies, some such resurgence of invincible thought—so little limited as it is within the bounds of "experience" (as the English school understands the term)—was to be looked for even in England, is apparent to any student of the history of philosophy, with its ceaseless action and reaction, strophe and antistrophe. No better definition of such a movement can be found than in Kant's definition of what metaphysics is, "*jenseit der Erfahrung liegende Erkenntniss*," a cognition which lies on the far side of experience.

And so it comes that we now have a small body of Hegelian writers—men who translate Hegel, who think like Hegel, who are touched, some perhaps almost unconsciously, by Hegelian dialectic. Chief amongst them is Dr. Hutchinson Stirling, who has published "*The Secret of Hegel*" and in his edition of Schweglér's "*History of Philosophy*" has warmly replied to Mr. Lewes'

attack on Hegel. In Oxford, which has never been quite weaned of its metaphysical tendencies, a similar spirit appears in Mr. Wallace's edition of "The Logic of Hegel," and Professor Green's "Introduction to the Works of Hume." To these might be added Professor Caird's "Kant," a criticism of the philosopher of Königsberg which is wholly Hegelian. Of the same spirit with this reaction is the curious, though evanescent, influence in England of Schopenhauer's "Philosophy of Pessimism," a spirit which was rampant in Byron and Byronic young men, but is intensely alien in reality to English thought. Pessimism is, of course, the privilege of youth in most countries; but that such influence could make any way at all in our uncongenial atmosphere is in itself a proof of the reality of modern German tendencies in this island.

What the exact importance or influence of this revival of German methods in philosophy may be it is as yet probably too soon to estimate. The *prima facie* objection that it is alien to our national modes of thought may be held to be of some weight; but it must be remembered that the highest English thought has often been touched by foreign influences, whether it be the Hebraic "passion for righteousness" which animates English religion, or the keen air of foreign travel which blows through every page of Elizabethan literature. The chief interest, however, to any dispassionate observer of English contemporary thought, who yet is wearied with the struggle of priest and savant, is to gauge the value of a new intellectual "departure"

in its bearings on the debateable country between Faith and Reason. By some men the new Hegelian metaphysics, in its apotheosis of Reason, may be hailed as providing the only substitute which a cultured and enlightened age can accept for the superannuated phases of "Faith," while others who refuse to recognise in such new garb the long-loved features of the religion which has been consecrated to them in lispings utterances learnt at a mother's knee, may hold at arms' length the doubtful advantages of novel, though generous allies. But doubt of this kind as to the exact value of a new form of philosophy can only be solved by time, and to time we must look to decide whether the leaves of the tree which are for the healing of the nations, and which have been gathered only in the garden of Gethsemane, can be ever found in the garden of the Academe.

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

### MODERN CULTURE AND LITERATURE.

General Definition and View of Modern Culture—Ascendency in it of the Romantic Spirit—First Element in Culture: the Artistic—Art an Equalising as well as Humanising Agency—Advance of Domestic Decorative Art since 1851—Influence of Mr. Ruskin: of Art Exhibitions—Improved Taste visible in Furniture and Embroidery—In Feminine Dress—In Home Decorations—General Characteristics of Modern English Painting—How far does Modern Art reflect the Spirit of the Age?—Explanation of the Popularity of Pre-Raphaelite Pictures, and Specimens of these—Whistler, Moore, Burne Jones—The Giorgionesque—Influence of Turner—Stimulus given to Artistic Impulse by other Art Critics than Ruskin: Hamerton, Colvin, Carr, Wedmore, Augustus Hare—Development of Art in Great Towns—Music an Element in Modern Culture—Are we a Musical Nation?—Music as reflecting Spirit of the Age—Second Element in Modern Culture: the Scientific—Progress and Organisation of Science in England—Popular and Famous Teachers of Science—Huxley, Tyndall, Lister, Sir Wyville Thompson—Charm of Science to Imagination—Influence of Science (1) upon Literature, (2) upon Religion—Relation of Science and Religion—Pessimism—The Pope of the Future—Other Elements in Modern Culture: Religion, Travel, Literature—General Tendencies of the Literature of the Time—Reaction against purely Literary Spirit—Mr. Matthew Arnold, Mr. Pater, Mr. J. A. Symonds—Poetry—Modern Poetical Schools—Mr. Tennyson, Mr. Browning, Mr. Swinburne, Mr. Morris, Mr. Alfred Austin—Novels—Novel-reading Classes—Novelists: Mr. A. Trollope, Mr. Charles Reade, Mr. E. Yates, Mr. Wilkie Collins, Mrs. Oliphant, Mrs. Linton, &c., &c.—Influence of George Eliot—Miss Broughton, Miss Braddon, Mr. L. Oliphant, &c.—Other Departments of Prose Literature—The New School of Historians—Mr. Freeman, Mr. Green, Mr. Froude—French Influences in Contemporary Literature—Mr. Frederic Harrison and Mr. John Morley—Serial Literature.

#### I.

WE have in this chapter to consider one of the most representative and complex products of nineteenth century England. When we speak of culture, we mean

the fusion of the higher influences of the age, artistic, scientific, religious, and literary. Glimpses of some aspects of the many-sided development may be caught in the streets of London and in other of our great cities, in drawing rooms, in picture galleries, in the periodicals of the day, wherever men and women meet together for the purpose of social conversation and pleasure. We recognise the indication of its presence in many ways and by many outward notes. Sometimes these are to be discovered in old china, in quaint furniture, in antique velvet hangings, in curiously shaped cabinets; sometimes in a rather mystical, and, to uninstructed hearers, unintelligible dialect; sometimes in a literary style remarkable for softness rather than vigour.

As it has been said that every one is a born follower either of Aristotle or Plato, so every age may be described as being mainly classical or romantic in its tendencies. Romanticism is certainly in the ascendant during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, both in poetry and in household paraphernalia. It is the age of mansions built, as to their exterior, in the style of Queen Anne, but nothing more alien to the spirit of the literature of that epoch than their interior could well be found. The genius of the romantic eminently suits a time at which the beauty of colour is worshipped as superior to the beauty of form. This preference it is which is the distinguishing characteristic of the romantic school, whether in art or literature. What the particular poets of the period—Mr. Swinburne,



Mr. Morris, Mr. Rossetti—are in literature, Mr. Whistler and Mr. Albert Moore are in art. Theirs are the poems, and theirs the pictures, in which it is natural that a cultured public, fascinated by peacock rooms, should delight. There is a sex in taste even as there is in flowers; and the sex which for the most part prevails just now not more in art than in literature and religion is feminine. As are the rooms we live in, so are the libraries which they contain. What Mr. Swinburne is among poets, Mr. Black, Mr. Blackmore, Miss Thackeray (Mrs. Ritchie) are among novelists—skilled, each of them, in the grouping of rich and varied tints, sometimes dazzling, often lulling the senses and causing them to sink into a slumber exquisitely sweet, but troubling themselves comparatively little, if at all, to attain to severity of outline or classical symmetry of proportions.

Art in the present decade is not only a great humanising, but a great equalising, power. The interchange of æsthetic sympathies, the compelling power of the brush and the studio—were we speaking now of matters theatrical, it might be added, of the stage—have become the instruments of a new kind of class fusion. The professional house decorator is no longer a mere tradesman or tradesman's employé. He is an artist, and he is entitled to receive the treatment of a gentleman. But on a larger scale than this, and in matters more important, art is a great leveller. It has done much, is doing much now, to give to the daily life of middle-class

England a grace and finish, the absence of which was long and bitterly deplored by æsthetic reformers. It is unlocking the door to a multitude of educating perceptions which have been systematically closed. It is imbuing with a sense of refinement—aristocratic in the best meaning of the word—the middle-class households of the land. Contrast the domestic interiors drawn in *Punch* by John Leech, about and before the time of the Hyde Park Exhibition of 1851, with those sketched by Mr. Du Maurier, and then judge of the interval which has been traversed. Fireplaces ornamented with Dutch tiles, carved oak chimney-pieces, costly wall-papers, dadoes, and all the other most perfect appliances and apparatus in which the artistic soul delights, may not be within the reach of every one. But little objects conceived in the true artistic spirit, and eloquent of the distinguishing tone of modern culture, which give a pretty air of finish of the right kind even to an apartment crowded by sins against the true æsthetic canons, may be bought wonderfully cheap. It is something, surely, that the Philistine British public, against whom Mr. Matthew Arnold has inveighed so often and so bitterly, has learned the use of the tints of pale olive, faint blue, dull yellow in its wall-papers, and sees, in the rich effect when a glass with scarlet chrysanthemums is placed against that background, what its true meaning is. How full of rest those dreamy curves and subdued tints are is best known to invalids, condemned formerly to gaze from a

bed of sickness on brilliant green wreaths or combinations of roses tied in impossible knots, and depicted in impossible hues.

The names of two individuals and of two institutions are prominently connected with this awakening on the part of the English public at large to the new artistic life—the late Prince Consort and Mr. Ruskin on the one hand; the Exhibition of 1851 and South Kensington on the other. Few men in the history of a nation have ever lent so powerful an influence to its scientific, artistic—some will add political—development as the husband of Queen Victoria. His taste and example gave an immense stimulus to the popularity of music. His encouragement was a signal advantage to British painting and sculpture and science. The world's fair in Hyde Park, when the present century had arrived at middle age, was not only the first of a series of international exhibitions, but did for art with the English public what Socrates did for philosophy when he brought it down from the gods to men—taught the English people that the goddess might be domiciled in a middle-class English home as well as in a Venetian palace. Had it not been for Prince Albert, this event, which marks an era in the history of the humanities in this country, might never have taken place. The work which the Exhibition began South Kensington has continued. To say that South Kensington might have held up a higher standard and a better model of artistic

imitation to the English public than it has done is not to destroy its claim to grateful recognition. Its influence has been in the direction of sweetness and light. It has inspired the mothers and daughters of England with ideas which, if they have about them nothing that is heroic, have about them also nothing that is not refining. It is the School of Art Needlework at South Kensington which, aided by that loving study of nature for which the present generation is indebted to Mr. Ruskin, has given us, instead of the tasteless antimacassars of old, chair-covers embroidered with such wreaths of jessamine, honeysuckle, or Virginia creeper, as we may see trailed along a garden wall or bower. Screens and chairs embroidered with delicate white acacia or laburnum, with pink and white hawthorn and myrtle; or else tapestried with larger designs of birds, and even with effects of trees and water; curtains covered with pomegranate or orange, fruits, and flowers; d'oyleys worked with field flowers: all these unquestionably indicate a great advance on the style in which our drawing-rooms were ornamented at the time of the Exhibition of 1851. In other words, we have, thanks to Mr. Ruskin, learned to replace the conventional by the results of that reverent study of nature which the author of "*Modern Painters*" has done more than any man living to promote. He it is who has taught those whose lot is cast in these latter days not only to love nature, but to discover a world of subtle and infinite beauty in her simplest, lowliest aspects: in the very

mosses which grow at our feet, and which, as he exquisitely reminds us, cover with their soft tapestry the last couch of earthly rest. "When all other service," he writes in "Modern Painters," "is vain from plant and tree, the soft mosses and grey lichens take up their watch by the headstone. The woods, the blossoms, the gift-bearing grasses, have done their part for a time, but these do service for ever. Trees for the builder's yard, flowers for the bride's chamber, corn for the granary, moss for the grave."

Those who have heard Mr. Ruskin in his Oxford lectures dwell with delight on the exquisite beauty of the strawberry-plant, leaf, flower, fruit, and stem, can never see it without remembering the glowing words that taught them how much perfection of outline and colouring they had too often suffered to pass under their eyes unheeded. So, too, has he pointed out to us the mystic beauty of the olive-tree, with its dim foliage, delicate blossoms, and dark fruit—which even the great southern masters of painting overlooked: possibly, because it was so near them—and of countless other things in earth and air and water.

The faculty of seeing more than meets the careless eye, and the cultivation of the faculty, have had other valuable effects than those which are purely artistic. By degrees our middle class are becoming gradually disabused of the vulgar idea that a large outlay is required for the tasteful arrangement of our rooms. The fact is recognised that the true artist can work, and work well, with

the very simplest materials. And these influences are already becoming visible in the dress of women. What is chiefly conspicuous in modern feminine fashions is the latitude of personal choice, the opportunity of individualism in costume which they allow, and above all things, the revolt against the Parisian dressmaker. There is certainly much less of rigid conformity to a single type than during the reign of crinoline, or during the interval which immediately followed, when ladies emulated in the limpness of their robes the appearance of one who might have just been immersed in a duck-pond. Nor does this hold true of dress only. Half a decade or a decade since the feminine hair was dressed after one uniform pattern, quite irrespective of the contour and requirements of head and face. Of course, a prevailing mode there still is—or, more correctly, two or three prevailing modes. But within certain and tolerably elastic limits there is a very considerable width of choice allowed. In other words, ladies are rightly claiming and discreetly exercising more of an intelligent and personal initiative than they have ever before done. The fact is gradually being recognised that dress really stands in the same relation to the physical form as language does to thought, and that as for each variety of the latter there is the expression which is most appropriate, so in the case of the former there must be a reasonable artistic relation between the garment worn and the person wearing it. Thus it is that art has descended from the cold heights on

which she once dwelt apart, and has thrown the grace of her presence over the familiar objects of every-day life. It is a further eminently satisfactory quality in the feminine costume of to-day that improvements in taste and economy to a great extent go together. Comparatively few ladies can afford such a dress as was exhibited at the School of Art in 1876, and afterwards sent to the Philadelphia Exhibition; but many, happily, can now work, and even design, borders of fruit and flowers, which give grace and character to the simplest costume, or paint sprigs of blossoms or clusters of flowers on the surface of silk and muslin skirts.

Even the domestic recreations of English homes in the present day illustrate the beneficent and humanising power of the artistic spirit. Painting on china is a graceful art, which is now not a little practised, and which has received special encouragement from the Princess Imperial of Germany. Blue and white chimney-tiles, dainty Watteau groups on china plates or terra-cotta may be executed by every one who has artistic taste and leisure to cultivate it. It is a common and a welcome sight to see the young ladies of an English family employed in decorating the earthenware cups and jugs manufactured and used by the peasants at Dinan—which may be bought for a few sous, and which take oil paint perfectly—with a little design of poppies or daisies that converts the jar or cup at once into an elegant article. Here one may surely trace, in however imperfect a manner, a humble realisation of the fancy illustrated by Mr. Longfellow in “*Keramos*”—the

graceful volume of verse in which he sings so well the art that was a passion with Bernard Palissy, the Huguenot potter.

When we approach the subject of modern English art, as embodied in the creations of the contemporary painter, we are in the presence of a difficult and delicate theme, which cannot here be dwelt upon with any pretence to completeness. It is charged against the latter day school of English painters that their art and imagination are divorced from the stirring events of the time; that the atmosphere, social, political, scientific, abounds in ideas which might well stimulate them to heroic efforts; that they lack the courage to grasp or the fancy to illustrate these; that if they exercise their fancy upon circumstances of English life they portray nothing nobler than a scene in a parlour or on a lawn, on the downs at Epsom, or at the railway station of Charing Cross; that the only type of the knight of chivalry whom they can see in contemporary society is the well-dressed young guardsman; and that their loftiest visions of womanly nobility and beauty are to be discovered in the persons of a bevy of pretty young ladies standing before a picture or engaged in a game of lawn tennis. In a word, our painters, when they do not devote themselves to the region of history, allegory, and legend, have, according to this view, lost the secret of the "grand style." Hence, it is alleged, the real traditions and the true and best idiosyncrasies of English art are not to be found in the painters of the period. They do not reflect English



character as Hogarth, Wilkie, Turner, and Gainsborough did. English character is full of enterprise and daring, is consumed by a restless thirst for action, is always eager for veritably imperial undertakings. Where, it is asked despairingly, can we look for any evidence of this in contemporary English art? And yet we are reminded, in the words of Sir Joshua Reynolds, "the ideal perfection and beauty are not to be sought in the heavens, but upon the earth. They are about us and upon every side of us." The whole of this question was ably discussed, though exclusively from one standpoint, by a writer in the *Quarterly Review* for February, 1879. "To represent action," said the writer, "in some form or another, is the aim of every great painter. In landscape, for example: how full of action is the painting of Turner, who may be truly said to have invented the great style in this branch of the art. The different lights and the far distances of his pictures blend in extraordinary sympathy with the human associations of the scene. His 'Rise,' and 'Decline of Carthage,' and his 'Fighting Téméraire,' though the representation of human life in these is entirely subordinate, have all the feeling of a great tragic poet. They seize the unseen worth or character of the subject." Now it is just this "action" which is complained of as being conspicuously absent from the most noticeable of modern pictures. Thus, Mr. Brett's "Cornish Lions" is a beautiful presentation of a dazzling blue sea, illuminated by a sunshine so brilliant as to make each cranny and indentation in the cliff visible. But the general

effect of the picture appears to this critic "to be that of suspended life." The same test is applied to Mr. Herkomer, whose picture of "Evening in the Work-house," with its predominant tone of sombre, hopeless peace, is contrasted with Wilkie's "Blind Fiddler" and "Blind Man's Buff;" to Mr. Long, who, it is admitted, has a keen dramatic sense, but who, in his Egyptian picture "The Making of the Gods," persists in employing it in realising the idea of an obsolete superstition; to Mr. Marks, who, it is deplored, gives up to dumb animals that faculty of active and energising creation which was surely meant for human kind. To sum up: the three chief faults of our modern pictorial art, in the opinion of a writer whose competence and representative position entitle his views to consideration, are these—first, the want of life-like vigour and action; secondly, the alienation of artistic fancy from the stirring events of the time; and thirdly, if contemporary history is resorted to, the selection of unworthy and common-place scenes and incidents. There is, of course, a protest against the feeble realism in the modes of thought prevalent among a certain section of society, and these modes of thought are bodied forth on some of the canvases of the period. Thus, the critic writes:—

"Those who last summer visited the Grosvenor Gallery found themselves in a region from which the vulgar and the familiar were fastidiously banished. If they had been offended in the Academy with the somewhat lavish imitation of particulars, they might here solace themselves with pure abstraction; if, in Burlington House, they had breathed with some difficulty the conventional atmosphere

of modern society, here at least they might retire into the middle ages; they might listen to the pastoral pipe of the Renaissance, roam among rocks and mountains that appeared to have strayed out of the pictures of Benozzo Gozzoli, or ransack their memories before the faces of knights and angels whose acquaintance they fancied they had made long ago on some canvas of Giorgione or Sandro Botticelli. Surely here, if anywhere, was to be found that artistic generalisation, that imaginative energy, which Sir Joshua Reynolds declared to be the characteristic of the 'great style.' Alas, no! The representative painters of the Grosvenor Gallery had even less conception of action than the painters of the Academy: for if the latter restricted themselves to imitation, at least they imitated actual life, but the former merely imitated certain peculiarities in the *style* of the old masters. Mr. Burne Jones is the chief master of this school. His picture entitled '*Laus Veneris*' represented a number of ladies sitting in the foreground, gorgeously attired, and in the background some knights in white armour looking in at a window as they rode by. The women in the chief group were doing nothing. They had even stopped singing the praises of Venus, which, it appears, was their sole resource for passing the time. They had all one type of face, one morbid kind of complexion, one monotonous expression, which culminated in the figure of the Queen, who, with her seat thrust back from the rest, her crown on her knees, and her feet far extended in front of her, seemed to have resigned herself to the dominion of *ennui*. A similar somnolent languor pervaded Mr. Jones's '*Chant d'Amour*;' indeed, so potent was its influence, that a Cupid, who had been apparently borrowed from Botticelli for the purpose of blowing the bellows of an organ—which for some reason the female musician has chosen to play on the top of a wall—had actually fallen asleep at his work. In like manner the abstractions of '*Day and Night*' and the '*Four Seasons*' indicated not the action of light and darkness, nor the variety of generation and production, but the perpetual presence in the painter's mind of thoughts on revolution and decay."

What is there to be said on the other side of the question, not so much as regards the technical merit of modern paintings—which is not now the quality in dispute—as on the subject of the relation existing

between the time and the works of pictorial art which it produces? Before we pass to this question, we may notice that while there is much that may yearly disappoint and anger the lover of art on the walls of Burlington House—much which, when one compares the crudity of colouring and the hastiness of outline with the mellow glow on the canvas of French or Belgian artists, might tempt Continental masters of the art to reverse the saying of Correggio when he first saw Raphael's masterpiece: "And I too am a painter!"—there is still one charming branch of art in which the supremacy remains to England. English water-colours are, and are likely to be, unrivalled. David Cox's "Hayfields;" Müller's "Eastern or English Scenes;" De Wint's "Church by the Banks of a Winding River," at South Kensington; George Mason's pictures of "Girls dancing by the Sea," "The Harvest Moon," "The Evening Hymn," exhibited a few years ago at the Burlington Fine Arts Club; Pinwell's "Mother of Thomas à Becket reaching London," a work of dream-like beauty; Frederick Walker's exquisite collection of drawings and sketches—the memorial of genius too early lost to us—among which, "The Right of Way," "The Fisher Boy," are perhaps the most perfect: these constitute sufficiently conclusive proofs of the superiority of English painters in water-colours.

Nor is it fair, or even intelligent, to speak in the language of unqualified depreciation of the Grosvenor Gallery and the school of art which it represents. The

extravagances of that school may seem sufficiently glaring. Yet if there is much in it which is crude and fantastic, there is much, too, which is fruitful in promise and rich in ideas. And many of these ideas are an integral portion of the true inspiration of the time in, and the scenes amid, which we live. Take the case of the wan figure of Autumn in the tableaux of the seasons, each of them entirely different from the received types, with the legend written below :—

“ London Autumn, here I stand,  
Worn of heart and weak of hand !  
Rest alone seems good to me—  
Speak the word and set me free.”

It was a sad, perhaps a morbid, view of Autumn this, but it was one not easily forgotten. Another representative specimen of this school of art may be witnessed in the “ Capture of Proserpine,” where the “ coal-black steeds ” bear the chariot upwards into the flowery meadow thick with narcissus, while across the pitch-black cavern whence they issue is trailed a flower of deep orange or flame colour. This contrast, the effect of which is in itself highly remarkable, is eminently characteristic of the school, and may be seen also in the memorial window erected to Frederick Vyner at Oxford. The designers of this are Messrs. Morris and Burne Jones, and almost all the colour is concentrated in the aureole of flame about the white-robed figure. Again, whatever affectation there may be in the phraseology applied by Mr. James Whistler to his pictures—“ Nocturnes,” “ Symphonies,” “ Caprices,”

it cannot be denied that they have a copious measure of suggestive poetry. The shower of sparks from a burning house thrown on the dark sky of night, the dim gleam of lamps; like gold and red stars through mist, idealising the effect of a London river fog—surely this is poetry; such poetry as any of us can see any day if we look for it.

While it is his obscurer effects which make Turner, who is too great to be the exclusive possession of any school, a special favourite with the high art school, Sandro Botticelli among mediæval painters, with his quaint serious angels and Madonnas, his filmy draperies and flowery backgrounds, is one of those who find most favour with the artists in colours whose corresponding artists in words are William Morris and Philip Bourke Marston. Nor is it only to Sandro Botticelli that we must go if we would find the original sources of these inspirations. Andrea Mantegna, more grand and processional in his outlines and groupings, is yet sufficiently pre-Raphaclite to please the school; Giorgione also, in spite of his later birth—the young Venetian whose pictures, lighted from within, as it were, by a golden glow—have fed the fancy of the neo-æsthetic sect. The influence of the “Giorgionesque” may be traced, to give an illustration, in Mr. Albert Moore’s “Sapphires”—a woman’s figure robed in loose draperies, her head crowned with a luminous turban. The splendid glow of blue and orange in her robes and jewels is gem-like, transparent, and radiant with splendour. It is easier for the uninitiated spectator to appreciate

the beauty of pictures such as these than of the presentations of those pallid red-haired figures, worn and wasted, those lank forms and clinging draperies, which are much affected by this school. Perhaps a picture of Tissot—"Autumn"—exhibited at the Grosvenor Gallery in 1878, may help the critic in some degree towards an understanding of the charm which may be found in these unlovely forms and ghastly visages. The charm of this work does not lie entirely in Tissot's masterly foreshortenings and perspectives. There is something more that appeals especially to the present generation. The pale, wistful young face, turned sadly back to us for a moment, while the figure, in heavy mourning robes, retreats swiftly along under the chestnut-tree, and the autumn wind sweeps down its large, yellow, fan-like leaves and scatters them thickly along her path, brings a message full of meaning to the heart of many a spectator in these days of sadness, weariness, unsatisfied yearning—a spirit which is expressed in that eager outlook into futurity called by the Germans "*Sehnsucht*." Nor may it only be that this kind of art, while certainly not representing English character, may be said to reflect a certain morbid and evanescent phase of English thought. It may also be regarded as a reaction from the realism which pervades so much of the art that is purely popular. From these pictures, which merely give us the outside aspect of things, it may conceivably be a relief to some persons to turn to those into which the curious imagination may read any meaning that

it chooses. To Turner, it has been said, nothing was common and unclean; and a Mason can invest with grace and beauty such a subject as "The Clothes Line." These are the cases of an exceptional power; and it is perhaps because so many of our cleverest painters fail to clothe the landscape and the objects which they depict with the hues of their imagination that there is a certain public which can enjoy the fantasies of pre-Raphaelitism.

There are other features yet to be noticed in the artistic aspect of modern popular culture. Mr. Ruskin has been the leader of the school of æsthetic prophets; his influence has germinated to such an extent that a considerable proportion of the literature of the day is purely artistic. First, there are the many periodicals devoted to art—such as "L'Art," the "Portfolio," and "The Magazine of Art,"—with their careful and conscientious, if somewhat artificially subtle, criticisms, and their beautifully executed engravings; then there are the different series, issued in shilling numbers, with a view of bringing home the rudiments of true art to English middle-class households; lastly, there is the crowd of writers upon art subjects who have efficiently continued the work that Mr. Ruskin began. Mr. P. G. Hamerton is at once an accomplished man of letters and an authority upon all subjects connected with the studio. The beauty of his style causes his works to be eminently pleasant and popular reading, while the thorough knowledge of his subject with which he writes insensibly develops in the reader an artistic feeling and insight. Distinguished



in this school of writing, of which Mr. Hamerton must be regarded as the chief, are Mr. W. H. Pater, who may almost claim to be the parent of the idea of the "Giorgionesque" in modern literature and art, Mr. J. A. Symonds, Professor Sidney Colvin, Mr. J. Comyns Carr, and Mr. F. Wedmore. Their books would be in demand independently of their subject, and they play the part of genuine teachers to the ordinary circulating library public, because there is nothing pedagogic, and much of natural and poetic beauty, in their manner. It is also to be noticed that the most popular literature of travel is that which is specially adapted to the taste of the artistic traveller. Such manuals as those written by Mr. Augustus Hare not only contain a great deal of well-compiled miscellaneous information, and abound in extracts from volumes like Nathaniel Hawthorne's "Transformation" and Mr. Story's "Roba di Roma," but display consummate insight into the foibles, vanities, and humours of the age for which they are written. They are precisely level with the standard of modern popular culture, are written mainly from the art point of view, and are really guide-books to artistic culture.

While a taste for and sympathy with arts, which, if they sometimes assume a fantastic and artificial shape, uniformly exercise a humanising influence, have been spreading throughout the community, the State has recognised the duty of encouraging and supporting art. Within the last half century there has been witnessed the foundation of a National Gallery, the embellishment

of the Houses of Parliament with an interesting series of historical frescoes, the formation at South Kensington of valuable collections, not only of modern pictures, but of objects of decorative and of industrial art, and of a department of State charged with the duty of superintending the teaching of art throughout the whole country by means of Schools of Design.\* Nor has provincial England fallen short of the active enthusiasm which, in the capital, has been displayed by the State. Government grants for art purposes are made to Edinburgh and Dublin; the large manufacturing towns receive nothing from the State, although private effort in them accomplishes much. It would certainly seem desirable that some of the artistic treasures of the British Museum should be occasionally lent to provincial galleries. Meanwhile, in Birmingham, Sheffield, Manchester, Newcastle, and elsewhere, the penny rate levied for free libraries, museums, and art galleries, liberally supplemented as this has been by private donations, has accomplished much, and has provided an elaborate and most effective machinery for educating the popular eye and taste. As yet, this artistic teaching has not done much for the improvement of the architectural aspect of our great commercial and industrial centres. Yet even here signs are not wanting that we have taken a new and nobler point of departure. There are structures in Liverpool which invest it with an imperial aspect, worthy of the

\* In 1878 there were considerably more than half a million persons receiving instruction in these establishments.

great place it occupies in our national system; again, Manchester, notwithstanding its unlovely streets, can boast warehouses of truly palatial appearance, and is adorned by a pile of buildings, erected for municipal purposes by the Corporation, which is at once a superb specimen of the genuinely English Gothic and a noble example to the rest of the United Kingdom. The study of architecture itself, and above all, the architecture of the Gothic school, have exercised an important influence on modern culture; signs have been witnessed of the revival of reality in opposition to sham, and it is much that oak and granite should be superseding spurious stone and stucco.

Among the individual influences to which the cultivation of artistic tastes may be ascribed, prominence has been already given to the name of the Prince Consort. While he did much to stimulate art, as well as science, it is probably in the domain of music that his example has been most powerfully felt and directly followed. Art, music, and the drama, each of them represent forces equally active amongst the English middle and upper classes. The reproach that the English are a race which has no music in its soul has only to be applied to our existing social state to be falsified by peals of harmony in every direction. Music, we are told from pulpits and platforms, in essays and in sermons, has had an influence not less refining than that of art upon the popular taste, and the head master of Uppingham School, one of the most successful schoolmasters of the

day, considers music essential to the education of youth. We have a Royal Academy and a National Training School for Music, of which the former receives an annual grant of £500 from Parliament. Music is also being taught in the elementary schools of the United Kingdom; and experience has shown that part-singing very often brings much innocent pleasure to the poorer classes, who are, probably, worse off than any people in the world for innocent amusements.

If it cannot be said that in England modern musical taste has resulted in the production of any composers of the first order, it has certainly given us a number of most sympathetic and intelligent audiences. Go to any great concert in any large town—notably to the Monday Popular Concerts held in London—and the chances are that a considerable minority of listeners will be found with a score-book in their hands. Even as regards composers our merits are at least respectable. Sterndale Bennett, the chief disciple of Mendelssohn, G. A. Macfarren, Arthur Sullivan, and Henry Smart constitute at least a remarkable group, and it is to be noticed that they have each of them belonged to the Academy, either as students or professors, or successively as both. Music is essentially the most cosmopolitan of all the arts and sciences; and nothing can be more to be desired for English music than that travelling scholarships should be instituted in the national musical colleges, the successful candidates for which should thus have the opportunity of studying the philosophy of sound in every part of the world. A popular artist of the day, Mr. Du

Maurier, has given us three pregnant illustrations of the music of the past, the present, and the future. The first represents a lady, a graceful little figure in Watteau costume, performing on the piano a melody of Mozart's. She is surrounded by a group of intelligent and appreciative hearers. Old and young—from the delighted grandfather to the little girl who stands hushed and quiet at her mother's side—are listening, as though the dreams of the gentle, pure-hearted composer were understood, and their elevating influences confessed in various measures by all present. Beneath we have the "Music of the Present." A young lady is performing with much execution some brilliant "Morçeau" by a modern master, while groups of ladies and gentlemen stand or sit about the piano, conversing among themselves, with polite indifference to the melody. Then we have the "Music of the Future"—portentous and terrific. A band of frantic wild-haired musicians are executing some piece of astounding loudness, while the auditors rush away, distractedly covering their ears. There is a story in the "Percy Anecdotes" which tells us that an organ sent by the Emperor of the East, Constantine Cupronymus, to King Pepin of France, A.D. 757, so strongly affected a lady who heard it for the first time that she became delirious for the rest of her days. Possibly, this event may be considered as pre-figuring the character of the musicians of the future. It may be doubted whether the artist does not, in the first of these tableaux, exaggerate

the musical attainments of our ancestresses: although a lady once performed in the hearing of Dr. Johnson a sonata, the extreme difficulty of which was proudly pointed out by her mother, only to provoke the characteristic, "Madam, I wish it had been impossible!" It was the very rare exception a hundred years ago to find anybody who could execute more than the simplest tunes on the spinet or harpsichord.

When we look at the more tumultuous pictures in the set above mentioned, we may perhaps recognise the reflection of the troubles and perplexities of modern life in the music of the period. It is probably only when they are regarded from this point of view that the extraordinarily intricate compositions of the Abbé Liszt or the prodigious tone-pictures of Wagner become intelligible. Here, too, may be discovered a reason why the palm of musical supremacy is generally accorded to the school of Germany. The soft and almost languid sentimentalism of Italian, the airy and sparkling brilliance of French composers, are not the echoes of those manifold sounds which constitute the gamut of human nature in the same way as the music of Germany. There may be an infinity of charm in Italian sweetness and in French variations, but for those harmonies which are the symbols in sound of the greatest joys, deepest sorrows, highest hopes, most painful conflicts of human nature, we must, probably, go to Teutonic minstrels. If proof of this is wanted, it is to be found in Wagner's opera of *Tannhauser*,

and in Schumann; at the same time, the influences both of Schubert and Chopin have had a profound effect in moulding the musical taste of the day.

We pass on to another, and as, perhaps, some will think it should be rated, the first, element in the popular culture of the day. The machinery for the teaching of science is even more highly organised than that for the teaching of art; nor does science lack the popularity and fashionable prestige which art conspicuously commands. There are classes for scientific instruction in all our great schools, and, independently of our great schools, in all our great towns. The universities award their highest distinctions to successful candidates in the examinations of which natural science forms the subject; and the foremost writers upon scientific matters are certainly the most popular among the authors of the day, and for the same reason that holds good of the artistic writers—viz., because their literary style is alike pleasing and perspicuous. The influence of the British Association for the encouragement of science increases every year, and acts as a kind of missionary in our great provincial towns. Naturalists and field-clubs are popular in country districts; and scientific institutes, with valuable scientific libraries attached, abound in our great centres of manufacturing industry.

In a very great degree the extent to which physical science is now cultivated must be attributed to the individual influence of two distinguished men. Mr. Huxley and Mr. Tyndall would be eminent as writers, even if they were not masters of scientific exposition.

It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that what Mr. Gladstone has done for finance Mr. Huxley has done for the facts of physical science. Upon medical training as well as upon general education and culture his influence has been equally manifest. The training of our future doctors and surgeons should, according to Mr. Huxley, be a department of the general education of the country, and should merely be a more minute and perfect elaboration of that scientific discipline which should be imparted in all national schools. Chemistry, botany, and physics would thus be subjects as universally recognised in our educational establishments as classics or mathematics. Those students who elected to follow a medical career would pass from the general schools to some one or other of the two or three great medical institutions with which Mr. Huxley would replace the multitude of smaller ones that at present exist. One may discover in the scientific writings of this distinguished teacher qualities analogous to those which are the chief notes of Mr. Ruskin as a writer on art. As Mr. Ruskin admires so deeply the exquisite beauty of the works of Nature in the vegetable world, so does Mr. Huxley explain, in language equally appreciative and happily chosen, and enforce by arguments strikingly suggestive and cogent, the marvellous thrift and wisdom which characterises all creation. There can be no better example of his power of interesting the popular attention on scientific matters than his essays and addresses, avowedly having for their subjects yeast, the formation of coal, the physical basis



of life. In each of these we have not merely the investigator and the philosopher, but the man of general culture, the scholar, and, as his essays on Berkeley and Descartes show, the interested metaphysician. Take his illustration of the nature of protoplasm as a singularly happy piece of popular exposition. He draws here a clever analogy between it and Balzac's story of the "Peau de Chagrin." "The hero," he continues, "becomes possessed of a magical wild ass's skin, which yields him the means of gratifying all his wishes. But the surface represents the duration of the proprietor's life, and for every desire satisfied the skin shrinks in proportion to the intensity of fruition, until at length life, or the last handbreath of the *peau de chagrin*, disappears with the gratification of a last wish." According to Huxley, this was the foreshadowing of a physiological truth: "at any rate, the matter of life is a veritable *peau de chagrin*, and for every vital act it is somewhat the smaller. All work implies waste, or the work of life results, directly or indirectly, in the waste of protoplasm." Happily for mankind, he continues to explain, the waste continually going on can be repaired by eating beef and mutton. "Mutton itself was once the living protoplasm, more or less modified, of another animal—sheep. . . . A singular inward laboratory which I possess will dissolve a certain portion of the modified protoplasm; the solution so formed will pass into my veins, and the subtle influences to which it will then be subjected will convert the dead protoplasm into living protoplasm, or transubstantiate the sheep into man." The sheep, in

turn, has received its protoplasm from the vegetable world, and thus the matter of life and thought is built up from the foundation to the summit of the common matter of the universe.

In a degree perhaps even greater than Mr. Huxley, Mr. Tyndall is the interpreter or populariser of science. "Sound," "Light," "Radiation," are the titles of books on subjects which, a few years ago, were strictly confined to scientific circles. Professor Tyndall has brought these topics, and an enormous amount of matter necessary for their illustration, from the laboratory, as the fore-court of the Temple of Philosophy, to the lecture-hall of the Royal Institution. Like Mr. Huxley, Mr. Tyndall's work has been directed to the annihilation of two great popular delusions—the first, the idea that either men or women will not be practically the happier and the better for the acquisition of scientific knowledge; the second, that education is really finished when school is left behind, and is not rather a process to be continued throughout life. Here, then, we may discover one of the surest antidotes to that mischievous tendency which some critics have discovered in modern scientific teaching. If it can be said that physical science has given man an exaggerated notion of his power over nature, it has also, as taught by its highest authorities, shown him how infinite is his ignorance, and implanted in the popular mind a desire to gain a greater insight into the operations of nature.

Nor is it only on intellectual grounds that the public is indebted to the services which scientific teaching has

## ENGLAND.

accomplished. Physical research has a further popular attraction : first, because it is perceived that some comprehension of it is necessary for healthy living ; secondly, because it is daily more and more recognised how truly philanthropic are its services. Probably, no man now living has had the honour of saving more human lives than Mr. Lister, Clinical Professor at King's College, London. His antiseptic treatment—the result of much patient inquiry and complicated research—has only slowly won recognition in London, though it has long since been adopted in America, and alleviated the agonies of countless victims in the course of recent European wars. On the death of Sir William Ferguson, the Clinical Chair of Surgery at King's College was offered to Mr. Lister, who, feeling that here a signal opportunity had presented itself for the fulfilment of his beneficent mission, gave up a lucrative practice and a distinguished position at Edinburgh. In coming to London Mr. Lister may be said to have been invading the enemy's country. He had not been in the capital a year before he may also be said to have conquered it, by the combination of high personal qualities with eminent scientific attainments and success.

Again, science occupies a conspicuous place among the forces which contribute to the sum of modern culture, not only because it deals with demonstrable verities, but because it opens a vista full of dazzling fascinations to the imagination. In this department of science the names of Sir Wyville

Thompson and Dr. Carpenter are entitled to prominent mention. The *Challenger* Expedition was organised by the Government, in deference to the repeated and emphatic representations of Dr. Carpenter, for the purpose of fathoming the mysteries of the waters beneath the earth. That the subject of deep sea exploration should have a vivid attraction for the popular mind is natural in itself, and is signally illustrated by the eagerness with which the public have flocked to hear lectures and to read books on the subject. We begin to be aware that we are entering upon the triumph predicted by Bacon for man over nature. We had already measured the earth, gauged the depth of its crust, ascertained the date of its genesis; we had weighed the sun, and constructed maps of the planets. It remained to sound the lowest depths of ocean, and to provide the materials for a picture of the economy of its abysses. Here we have found Nature in the very midst of that work which she has been carrying on for countless ages, as busy now as when first she undertook the development of the planet we inhabit out of mist, haze, and floating nebulae.

Mr. Huxley and Mr. Tyndall have both of them a distinguished opponent in Mr. St. George Mivart, who, though a firm champion of Roman Catholicism, would admit some of the cardinal principles of Mr. Huxley and Mr. Tyndall. Thus he would not deny that the general appearance of the world justifies the conclusion that all species have been introduced by a process of evolution. He would, however, deny that evolution and

the mere operation of secondary laws are enough to explain those phenomena and those attributes which are most especially distinctive of man. Granted, he might possibly allow, that you can account for the formation of the human body in the same way as you may account for the formation of the bodies of other animals, how, he would ask, are you to account for the growth of that intelligence which specially differentiates man from other animals, or for that sense of justice which, in however rudimentary a form, is implanted in the rudest and most savage nations? Apropos of this latter point, Mr. Mivart cites the instance of a ferocious and uncivilised Australian tribe, one of whose punishments is the thrusting of a spear into the thigh. If, for certain offences, he says, the weapon is embedded too deeply in the human flesh, the victim of the wound protests. What, he asks, is this, if not a sense of justice, showing itself in however primitive a form? When Messrs. Huxley and Tyndall explain human intelligence and those sentiments which we recognise as moral by the simple statement that they have been evolved by the ordinary operation of secondary laws, actively in progress, through innumerable successions of generations, Mr. Mivart would observe that the generations of the lower creatures have been infinitely more numerous, not only as regards the rapidity of their sequence, but in view of the period from which they date, than the generations of men. If, therefore, the mere lapse of time has not given to animals and insects, eminently endowed with a sort of intelligence, precisely

that variety of intelligence which is to be found in man, how is the phenomenon to be accounted for save by the hypothesis of the intervention of some superior power—in other words, of the Divine action. Mr. Alfred Wallace, himself a follower of Mr. Darwin, and a believer in evolution, admits the existence of this difficulty, and seems disposed to explain it by the assumed operation of spirits.

It was inevitable that the extraordinary advance and development of scientific culture should influence both the literature and religion of the day. Physiology and psychology—the latter being, for the most part, resolved into the former—control or powerfully tincture the imagination of at least one of the leading spirits of our modern literature. Scientific terminology is introduced to indicate the facts, feelings, and phenomena with which the novelist and the poet deal. There are many phrases in the later works of George Eliot which are absolutely unintelligible to the reader who has not been also in some degree a student of physical or mental science. It is, indeed, no new thing that the scientific conceptions of the period should be mirrored forth in contemporary literature. Homer, Dante, and Milton all adopt and illustrate the current cosmogonies of their era. In the “*Iliad*” and the “*Odyssey*” there is the same scheme of the universe shadowed forth as in the primitive charts of the geographer. The “*Divine Comedy*” has well been described by a critic of our day—Mr. Edward Dowden—as a harmony of philosophy, physics, and poetry; while in “*Paradise Lost*” the

astronomical theories were not more fancifully unsound than they were elaborately consistent. Nor in the present age is the motto of all our poets "art for art's sake." The doctrine of human progress penetrates the verse of Mr. Tennyson, and what has been called the "cosmical feeling for nature"—the consciousness that in the infinite complexity of the world there is still unity—is not more visible in Mr. Carlyle than in the Laureate. When Teufelsdröckh exclaims, "Force, force, everywhere force; we ourselves a mysterious force in the centre of these!" he hints at the same truth as is embodied in the lines entitled "The Higher Pantheism."

"Flower in the crannied wall,  
I pluck you out of the crannies;  
Hold you here, root and all, in my hand,  
Little flower—but if I could understand  
What you are, root and all, and all in all,  
I should know what God and man is."

But this is only a less characteristic illustration of the influence of science upon literature. Literature has not merely been influenced by science, but invaded by it; and when a critic, able, learned, and in this case profoundly sympathetic—Mr. R. H. Hutton—can only explain in such a passage as the following the meaning of a poem, it is clear that we are rapidly replacing the old school of literary by a new school of scientific critics:—

"If I may venture to interpret so great a writer's thought, I should say that 'The Spanish Gipsy' is written to illustrate, not merely doubly and trebly, but from four or five distinct points of view, how

the inheritance of the definite streams of impulse and tradition stored up in what we call race often puts a tragic veto upon any attempt of spontaneous individual emotion or volition to ignore or defy their control, and to emancipate itself from the tyranny of their disputable and apparently cruel rule. You can see the influence of the recent Darwinian doctrines, so far as they are applicable at all to moral characteristics and causes, in almost every page of the poem. How the threads of hereditary capacity and hereditary sentiment control, as with invisible cords, the orbits of even the most powerful characters; how the fracture of those threads, so far as it can be accomplished by mere *will*, may have even a greater effect in wrecking character than moral degeneracy would itself produce; how the man who trusts and uses the hereditary forces which natural descent has bestowed upon him becomes a might and a centre in the world, while the man, perhaps intrinsically the nobler, who dissipates his strength by trying to swim against the stream of his past is neutralised and paralysed by the vain effort; again, how a divided past, a past not really homogeneous, may weaken this kind of power, instead of strengthening it by the command of a larger experience—all this George Eliot's poem paints with a tragical force that answers to Aristotle's definition of tragedy, that which 'purifies' by pity and by fear."\*

The points of contact between science and religion are sufficiently recognised by theological teachers of our time. No clergyman in England, of any denomination, would venture to address for successive weeks a congregation at all highly educated without keeping himself abreast of the scientific literature of the day. It is to be noticed that the manner in which science is dealt with by theology, and theology by science, is no longer what it once was. Science was used by Paley to overcome the religious difficulties suggested by reason; reason is now used to show that religion is capable of scientific treatment. Nor does the

\* "Essays" by R. H. Hutton, pp. 348, 349.



professional teacher of religion altogether deny this; for the most part he admits the probable truth of many scientific hypotheses. If he is a Roman Catholic or High Anglican, he meets the declaration of the irreconcilable feud between the discoveries of geology and the letter of the first chapter of Genesis with the admission that it may be as the geologists assert, and that the Church has not spoken authoritatively on the subject. If he takes his stand upon the basis of a liberal latitudinarianism, he is not concerned to deny the Darwinian theory of evolution. Religion, he holds, begins where science ends. There is a term which science is impotent to pass. Behind the law of nature must be the Law-giver; beyond the phenomena must be their great First Cause.

Nor is the attitude assumed by science towards theology hostile, in the sense in which many of Faraday's contemporaries, most unlike Faraday himself, were the enemies of revelation. Modern science speaks with condescension of "our noble Bible," and affably prepares the "Prayer Gauge" as the best solution of a vague question. A similar rationalism, though manifested in a somewhat unattractive way, is perceptible in the philosophical analysis of human sentiments given by Professor Bain, who considers the affection of a mother for her child—which Victor Hugo, in the happy phrase of genius, has spoken of as "divinely animal"—as "purely animal." The late Charles Kingsley, commenting upon the opinion of Professor Bain not long before his death, said: "The

end of such a philosophy must be very near." It has been finely shown by one of the most distinguished of contemporary theologians that the great crowning fact of Christian history is "not the solution, but the illumination of the mysteries of life." This is an hypothesis at least as legitimate in its way as many of the hypotheses of science. The truths of science are eternal; scarcely so the ascendancy over the individual of a science which is apt entirely to ignore the imaginative element in man. Physicism, in its present shape, can scarcely hope to supplant religion; and if it be said that science is really more of a creed at the present day than theology, it is possible that the world may swing back from that state which marks nothing more than the temporary supremacy of Pessimism. Pessimism, as the correlative of Optimism, has always existed, and it now sounds audibly, in a pathetic minor, through much of our literature, philosophy, and art. If it really be the case that natural science has at the present day taken in many the place of faith, the question is not so much, Will the new reign of reason be permanent? as, For what limited period will it last? Whoever the Pope of the future may be, will his garb be that of the physical inquirer? It may be that the next era of philosophical investigation will be one in which moral laws take the place of physical laws as the object of search. The physical order of the universe we have now almost ascertained; is there a moral law which will submit to the same process of analysis

and inquiry? At the same time, the prospect of such an investigation involves the assumption of a reaction against science which may be thought to be extremely improbable. The importance of evolution, in its bearing upon morals, is that it really tends to deprive ethics of its position as an independent science, making it a mere appendage of physics, and causing it to stand in the same relation to physics as does political economy to the larger science of sociology.

This analysis of the social and intellectual conglomeration spoken of as modern culture, is necessarily most imperfect. That the chief elements in modern culture are the artistic and scientific can scarcely be doubted. But when once these are subject to fresh influences, or are combined in changed proportions, the result is what is practically a novel substance. The new facilities of Continental travel have coincided with the interest which art preachers have aroused in Continental picture galleries, and the mind thus passes, by a natural transition, from the contemplation of objects to the events which cluster round them. Art is the high priestess who takes the average Englishman or Englishwoman to the threshold of history, and the culture with which history, as it is now studied, enriches the human intelligence, is being more largely and vividly felt every day. Grote, Freeman, Seeley, and Green—these are only the names of a few of those writers who have taught the general public to regard history not as the bare narrative of occurrences, or as a confused collection of

dates and names, but as the continuous illustration of the practical working of moral and political laws. The difference between such historians as these and those of an earlier age consists of the fact that at the present day sociology is recognised as a specific science. There is now seen to be a unity in the chronicles of all countries and all ages. The annals of classical Greece and Rome are only a segment of the universal annals of mankind, of which the history of France or England, Italy or Germany, is the sequel. The study of history is recognised as involving whatever is characteristic of the exercise of the human intellect, or commemorative of its toils and triumphs. Nor is the history of a nation only to be found in its written records. It is recognised as embodied in its art treasures and stored in its antiquarian remains. In this way art culture becomes a portion of, and subsidiary to, historical culture.

The same process has been applied to religion, which has afforded ground for the exercise of the combined functions of art, history, and science. It is not only by the services of an æsthetic ritualism that the imaginative faculty is gratified; free scope is given to it in many of the literary products of ecclesiastical rationalism—the most decided adversary of ritualism. Such works as “*Ecce Homo*” and “*Philochristus*” are steeped in a sympathetically glowing imagination on every page. To the picturesque description designed with an eye to artistic effect must be added the critical study of the Bible: this criticism itself being

but a manifestation of the general spirit of the time. Only a school of commentators, steeped to their finger-tips in nineteenth-century culture, would venture to lay such exclusive stress upon the moral side of Christ's life and teaching, and would abandon not only the miracles, but entire episodes in the sacred narrative of the New Testament. Only apt followers of such a master as Mr. Matthew Arnold, the great professor of nineteenth-century culture, would consider themselves competent to decide what passages are genuine, what are the immoral perversions of ignorant disciples, and what is the point at which it becomes desirable or necessary to turn from the Calvinism of St. Paul to the milder Christianity of an earlier age. It would be equally difficult to overestimate Mr. Matthew Arnold's influence either upon the religious or æsthetic thought of the day, and with these must be classed Mr. Max Müller's "Science of Religion," and other religious writings. As for the net result of both, is it not to evaporate religion itself into mere morality on the one hand, or into history on the other?

## II.

Displays of literary activity abounding on every side and in every department of knowledge, it may be considered a paradox to say that this is not a literary age. The remark, however, is strictly true. Never was there more writing; never did the literary

spirit occupy a more subordinate place. Literature is didactic, theological, æsthetic, scientific, anything but purely literary. To read for reading's sake is unintelligible to the mass of the educated public. There is much to be said in favour of the various contemporary manuals and biographies, of famous authors, ancient and modern, English and foreign, with specimens of their writings and analyses of their more important works. But they furnish a striking commentary on the truth of the proposition advanced. Twenty pages of the poet or the historian studied in the original might give the student a better insight into the spirit of an author, whether in prose or verse, than two hundred pages of brightly written summary. But the facts are what is wanted. We, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, have in some things a passion for completeness and distinctness. We like outlines sharp and clear. We prefer a decoction of a deathless bard in a pocket volume to periodical dipping into works that occupy half a dozen shelves in our libraries.

Of the prevailing tendency on the part of literature to merge itself in something which is not literature there could be no better illustration than the distinguished man of whom in the former section of this, as well as in a preceding chapter, mention has more than once been made. Mr. Matthew Arnold is master of a style of supreme delicacy and subtlety, has enlarged the conceptions as well as illustrated the true uses of literary criticism; a writer whose genius

is, if ever any genius was, literary above all things. But although both his religious and his political position are exclusively defined by his literary spirit, he breaks into the fields of politics and religion. In other words, though his tests and standards are nothing but literary, he insists on applying them to matters which are not literary. Possessing a critical sense of exquisite fineness, he ventures to test by its application the limits of the inspiration of Scripture, and to decide by its voice what elements of a national Church organisation are to be assimilated by modern culture and what refused.

While Mr. Arnold may be spoken of as the founder of the school of æsthetic literature, his followers have contributed to it much which is distinctively their own. Literary finish seldom reaches a finer point than in the writings of Mr. W. H. Pater and Mr. J. A. Symonds. Both may have some artificialities as well as rare excellencies of style, but both have written books of solid learning and research. Mr. Symonds' "History of the Renaissance" is the product of study and scholarship. Mr. Pater's essays on the same subject have a value which all impartial critics admit. In each case, however, it is rather art than literature which gains. Mr. Shairp, Professor of Poetry at Oxford, is a critic of a very different order. He, at least, has nothing in common with the school of artistic hedonism. But he is as little content as they are with being a critic of literature, pure and simple. He discovers in all that he analyses

elements which do not meet the common eye. One poet is with him the oracle of an ethical system; another, of a complex scheme of the interpretation of nature.

The same truth holds almost equally good in the case of the poetry of the day. Frequently, indeed, its inspiration is derived from distinctly literary sources: from Homer, as in the case of so much which Mr. Tennyson has written; from the Greek tragic poets, or the French and Italian of the sixteenth century, as in the case of Mr. Swinburne. But there is a disposition to regard the poetry which has not a mission of its own as of small account. It is not enough that a writer should be a poet, pure and simple. There is no writer living who stands in quite the same relation to his age as Byron. The poet of the period is either the musical oracle of paganism and the Revolution; or he attempts to escape into the life of an old world, throwing only a few accidental sidelights on that of the modern; or he takes a speculative interest in what men think and feel, and do and believe; or he is a philosopher in verse, a pathologist in metre, like Mr. Browning. Has poetry a message for a hard-toiling, anxious generation? What is that message? Is it to be announced in language inspired by the past, or the present? Is there any gospel which the race of bards may proclaim to mankind? These are not questions which have as yet been answered, or on which, if the effort to answer them has been made, any unanimity can be



said to exist. The whole poetic atmosphere seems to echo with the din of controversy, sometimes loud and sometimes faint. But noise is always there; the issue always undecided. Our modern bards are divided into factions, and each fresh product of their muses might be described as a pamphlet in verse. An outburst of magnificently melodious defiance, proclaiming that men and gods are equally naught, elicits its response in the apotheosis of the shadowy and intangible, and a writer like Mr. Philip Bourke Marston pours forth a protest against Mr. Swinburne.

Mr. Browning, who has written some of the finest and most stirring lyrics in the century, seems to have decided that poetry should be the instrument for the dissection and analysis of the complex phenomena of life. No modern writer has a stronger grasp of the great problems of modern existence, or is less readily intelligible to the masses. Mr. Tennyson induces reverie; Mr. Browning stimulates study: the one charms; the other stretches on the rack. The poetry of the former is as a melodiously whispering zephyr; the poetry of the latter as a searching blast from the north-east. The poems of Mr. Matthew Arnold occupy a distinct place of their own. They are the distilled and luminous essence of metrical thought, exquisite in idea, and masterpieces of expression. There remains a host of writers of whom many have attained a high standard of excellence. We have had few more melodious singers than the late Mortimer Collins, a kind of Rochester born out

of his due time. If music allied to power is wanted, it will be found in the compositions of Robert Buchanan. The historical dramas of the lady who writes under the name of Ross Neil have not only melody, but grace and power, while Aubrey de Vere shows in the same class of compositions the same qualities.

Mr. Alfred Austin is a poet of a different order. Beginning as a satirist, and producing in "The Season" a composition which has the true classical ring, he has gradually abandoned that department of literature, and has written a series of works, the most important of which have been collected in one volume, under the title of the "Human Tragedy." Much that is memorable in the history of contemporary Europe, in its state of feeling, and in the ideas and controversies of the age, civil and religious, is reviewed in its pages, and so, while the poem is thus eminently historical, it contains a message as well, whose first key-note is struck in the opening canto.

"Yet not of Love alone, its advent blind,  
Swift raptures and slow penalties, I sing.  
I must be lifted on a fiercer wind,  
And from the lyre a louder anthem wring;  
Still as Religion, Country, or Mankind  
Bids my weak hand sound more sonorous string.  
Ah, fatal four! which by the dark decree  
Of Heaven evolve the Human Tragedy!"

In the first canto, or, as Mr. Austin prefers to call it, act, is traced the development of love. In the

second, the contest between love and religion. In the third, the conception of country is added, and the combined operation of each passion is illustrated in the events of Italian history during the late autumn of 1867. In the fourth act a new element in the complication is added by the appearance of "mankind" upon the stage, and the conflict is explained in these stanzas :—

" See then, my child, the tragedy, and see  
 What feeds it. Love, Religion, Country, all  
 That deepest, dearest, most enduring be,  
 That makes us noble, and that holds us thrall,  
 Once gone, the beasts were no more gross than we—  
 'Tis these for which the victims fastest fall ;  
 Man's self, in days that are as days that were,  
 Suppliant alike and executioner !

" Now once again this tragedy, this jar  
 Of conscience against conscience, hath, meseems,  
 In Paris struck the flinty flame of war ;  
 Likely, they slay for straws, they die for dreams,  
 But things that seem must still be things that are,  
 To half-experienced man, who perforce deems  
 He doth not dream, but knows not, nor can know,  
 Till death brings sleep or waking, is it so."

Such is the Human Tragedy according to Mr. Austin, its factors being love, religion, country, and mankind. The opposing forces between whom the struggle is are innate in humanity ; how are they to be reconciled ? The answer is, by the agency of love ; and so the first line of Mr. Austin's poem, " Oh, Love, undying Love, eternal star," is also the last.

Of all the works that are read widely, the most

widely read are novels. They form nearly the sole literary nourishment of a large class of the population. They have much of the influence which in other countries belongs to the stage. They regulate the views of life of hundreds and thousands of women, especially in the lower middle section of society, old and young. The mothers and daughters of the English aristocracy out of the London season may read as many novels as the daughter or wife of the small tradesman. But in the latter case there is none of the opportunity possible in the former of correcting the mawkish and mistaken impressions of existence conveyed by the class of writings which these young women devour. They are as much possessed with the ideas introduced to their minds as a child in a nursery is by the images and incidents of a fairy tale. They grow to believe that life around them is full of those glittering possibilities which may elevate them to the same social levels as romance heroines. For them the dramatis personæ of their favourite author have their antitypes and originals in the world of flesh and blood. Cophetua may descend to them in robe and crown at any moment. They go to the dress-circle at the play with the word "kismet" trembling on their lips, and they are anxiously expecting to see their "fate" at a half-crown concert.

But while many novels are merely foolish stories, introducing the reader to a world which is not that of real life, and void of any attempt to grapple with

life's serious problems, there is a steady increase in the number of those which have a sensible and wholesome relation to actual existence, and which have both an historical and educational value. Mr. Anthony Trollope's fictions are photographs of nineteenth-century life in pen and ink. They have for contemporary readers just the same kind of interest as the domestic comedies of the late Mr. Robertson, or those collections of cartes de visite which used to be found in drawing-rooms more frequently than now. They do not represent a great force in literature—though Mr. Trollope may have many imitators—like George Eliot, but they give hundreds and thousands of men and women, of all ages and of all ranks, exactly what they want—light easy reading, that requires no special thought, that is at once a pure recreation, and that presents to them, as if reflected in a mirror, the society amidst which they live. Mr. Edmund Yates, though he is no longer an active novelist, recognises more of the seamy side of life than Mr. Trollope, and introduces us into an atmosphere laden with different issues and associations, but his men and women are living realities, not abstractions. The incidents and the episodes are taken from life; the dialogue is that which may be heard every day; the moral, if moral is to be extracted from his writings, may not be welcome, but the data on which it is based are those collected from experience by a singularly acute mind equipped with a large store of imagination, fancy,

and humour. Mr. Charles Reade may probably be spoken of with correctness as the greatest living master of English realistic romance. Some there may be who will contend that the honours of this distinction should be divided between him and Mr. Wilkie Collins. As creators and developers of a plot, both may advance the same claim to consummate mastery. But there is this difference between the two: Mr. Wilkie Collins always introduces an element which, if it is not directly supernatural, is suggestive of the supernatural—of coincidences so strange and weird that the enumeration of them gives us a sentiment of uncanniness—

“The air is full of omens. Scarce had I set  
My foot outside the threshold ere I met  
A dog. He barked; full well that bark I knew.  
I met another, and, lo! he barked too.”

The idea contained in these lines is one of which it is impossible not to be reminded by Mr. Wilkie Collins' writings, and there is nothing of the same sort to be found in those of Mr. Reade. Mr. Reade's novels are, in fact, novels above all things with a purpose, and whatever of stirring or sensational incident they may have is introduced quite as much to point the moral as adorn the tale. Of three or four other novelists of the time may it be said that they chiefly strive to do for the day that which Dickens or Thackeray did. Colonel Lockhart, Mr. James Payn, Mr. Francillon, Mr. George Meredith, master of a terse

and pregnant style, Mr. Justin McCarthy, Mr. Besant, and Mr. Rice—each of them write not only with skill and humour, but with much knowledge of the world in which they live. They all of them paint contemporary men and women, and all have their value for the historians of the future.

There is the same desire to treat with fidelity and with fulness the questions of the day, to illustrate the characters and the complications which the events of the time are calculated to develop, in Mrs. Oliphant, in Mrs. Lynn Linton, Mrs. Cashel Hoey, Mrs. Alexander, Mrs. Edwards, and many others. Cleverness and ingenuity are the characteristics of the works of all these writers, though the three first named are those who recognise more fully the gravity of the daily issues of our life, the perpetual conflict of duties, the deeper motives of ordinary action, the ulterior tendencies of much that is petty and trivial, the irony which besets existence. In two of these authors, Mrs. Linton and Mrs. Hoey, it is impossible not to recognise the influence of the most powerful of modern novelists. Both of them resemble George Eliot in their habit of weighing the relative morality of motives and acts, of showing how terribly complicated is the chemistry of life, and in their appreciation of the perpetually conflicting issues. As regards style and manner, treatment and phraseology, George Eliot has had an incomparably wider influence than any author living. This is partly, of course, because of the contagious power which genius ever

carries with it, but partly also because she represents in her own writings so many of the tendencies of the times; because she is, as so many of our poets are, almost morbidly introspective, analytical. Rightly understood, George Eliot's novels are a complete system of moral philosophy. The position taken by the author is that life is a tremendous series of human consequences; that the results of acts committed lightly or thoughtlessly are infinitely far-reaching, involving the happiness not only of the agents themselves, but of countless others; and that each individual is thus under an appalling responsibility both to his fellows who are alive and to the posterity as yet unborn. This great writer, taking a view which is peculiarly her own of the relations of human life, not unnaturally expresses that view in strange and unfamiliar language. But in the terms thus employed there is no real pedantry. George Eliot writes as the high priestess of a special school of philosophical thought, and it is necessary, to convey her precise shades of meaning, that she should adopt words of technical sound.

Of novelists such as "Ouida," Miss Braddon, and Miss Rhoda Broughton, there is little which remains to be said. The first of these began with placing in the setting of a feminine imagination the materials of pictures drawn by George Lawrence and Whyte Melville. She has since then come powerfully under the agency of that pagan æstheticism which is an important element in modern culture, and to this



she has added that experience of foreign countries and extended travel which is seen in many other of the novelists of the period. Miss Braddon's popularity with the middle classes does not seem to wane. She is an excellent writer of clear idiomatic English, and she has of recent years shown that she can produce an interesting story without having recourse to the sensational machinery which was supposed to be essential to her success. Miss Rhoda Broughton is the leading representative of the school of literary piquancy. She has brought freshness and ingenuity into the well-worn ways of domestic fiction. She has followers and imitators, but she has few, if any, rivals. Miss Broughton may not be a force of the highest kind, but a force, for all that, in modern literature she distinctly is.

What has been witnessed in other walks of literature may also be seen in the fictions of the day. There have recently been produced several novels in which musical culture is the prominent element of interest, the chapters being headed with bars of music. Here, too, there may probably be traced the influence of George Eliot, whose genius in her earliest novels was as distinctly towards music as latterly it has been towards the philosophy of Positivism. With her, in this matter, should be associated the name of George Macdonald, whose novel, "Robert Falconer," was largely devoted to subtle questions of melody. But George Macdonald is only a novelist incidentally, and he is

really a moral and religious homilist, who popularises his sermons by giving them the form of fictions. Mr. Lawrence Oliphant cannot be called a theological writer, but in his "*Piccadilly*," which has had an immense influence upon the writing of the day, he has probed very deeply some of the greatest of modern problems. There are, however, many novels, and some of those the best and most popular of our time, which may be regarded as protests against the restless, feverish, perplexed, and inquiring spirit which animates much of modern fiction. The pleasant sketchy romances of Mr. Hamilton Aidé, Mr. Walford, Mr. Julian Sturgis, and others, afford not only a relief, but a remonstrance to that delirious unrest of which Kingsley's "*Yeast*" may be taken as a type. Ascending higher in the scale of literary excellence, we have, as distinguished ornaments of what may be called the idyllic school, amongst ladies, Miss Thackeray, the authoress of "*Vera*," and others; amongst gentlemen, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Blackmore, and Mr. Black. A variation of the same impulse which causes Mr. Morris to invite his readers to accompany him in his quest after an earthly paradise, induces these authors to dwell with lingering love and profuse labour upon those aspects of life which are in danger of being forgotten in this sophisticated, urban, and smoke-begrimed epoch. They speak to us out of the fulness of their hearts, and Mr. Blackmore shows us his *dramatis personæ* amid the cherry orchards of Kent or on the open downs of Sussex, as Mr. Black takes us to

the Hebrides or the Land's End—from an instinctive affection for those regions and a happy consciousness that their abilities will find here the most congenial scope. The tendency of some of the writers of this school is perhaps towards a rather too nebulous picturesqueness. Colours are blended hazily together. The clear hard outline is lost. The senses begin to grow drowsy under the influence of excessive sweetness, and the effect is that of literary lotus-eating. Mr. Blackmore's fiction, in addition to its artistic elegance and beauty, is always thrilling, is generally founded on fact, is written in a nervous, vigorous style, is marked by a vivid fancy and a strong sense of humour. Mr. Black's novels are invariably graceful, and abound in charming description of sea and shore, rocky coast, green islands. Mr. Hardy, equally original as a writer and thinker, displays the same disposition as Mr. Black to repeat himself, and is apt to carry the idiosyncrasies of his style to the point of mannerism. As a sketcher of certain aspects of English rural life, and, above all, of English peasants, he is in his way unique. Like Mr. Black, Mr. Blackmore, and Miss Thackeray, Mr. Hardy is fond of heightening the effect of his idyllic and pastoral scenes by investing them with a certain mysticism, and the accents of irresistible doom, more or less disguised, seem audible in the murmur of every passing breeze.

It is to be expected that an age of which the literary taste is pre-eminently for the literature of positive information and instructive fact should be

favourable to the production of volumes of travel and biography. These, indeed, issue from the press in an incessant stream. Their subject matter is found in all lands and in all periods. Every country in which the English language is spoken, or in which it is deemed desirable by an ardent patriotism that the English flag should float, finds its immediate and assiduous chronicler, and in the footsteps of the imperial pioneer there inevitably follows the literary memorialist. Our Australasian colonies, every part of our Indian dependency, every aspect of Indian life, South Africa, Central Asia, have all of them yielded materials for a library of their own. The biographer has not lagged behind. The most popular book of the time, less than ten years ago, was Mr. Hare's "*Memorials of a Quiet Life.*" In his work on Macaulay, Mr. G. O. Trevelyan not only showed that he had powers which, if applied exclusively to letters, would win for him a conspicuous place among nineteenth-century writers, but achieved a popular success not unworthy of the triumph which waited on the historical achievement of his illustrious uncle; while in his "*Life of Lessing,*" Mr. Sims produced as enduring a monument as may be witnessed in the "*Voltaire*" or "*Diderot*" of Mr. John Morley.

The literature of modern theology and history is even more prolific. Of the former we have spoken elsewhere, yet there remain one or two names which should not be omitted, and on which further stress should be laid. One of the greatest masters of English

style, as he indisputably is also of English dialectic, whom the age has produced is in the first place a theological writer. John Henry Newman is a master of the English language in the same sense that a perfect musician may be called the master of his instrument. There is no note in its varied scale which he cannot produce from it. He has conveyed, perhaps, a fuller idea of its capabilities than any writer in our tongue, has shown more completely how it may be made to yield alternate sounds of majesty and pathos, of invective and persuasion, of irony and earnestness. The religious sentiment is illustrated in all its manifold phases in the "University Sermons;" the clearest ratiocinative power shows itself in the "Grammar of Assent;" as an historian, he has given us one of the best pictures of ancient Athens ever drawn; as a poet, in addition to the "Dream of Gerontius," such lyrics as "Lead, kindly Light." The popularity of Canon Farrar, the author of the "Life of Christ" and the "Life of St. Paul," grows daily, and the circle of the humanising influence of these works, and many other works of the same order, perpetually spreads. Dean Stanley, whether as divine or historian, preacher or essayist, has as many readers as Carlyle. Than the name of the accomplished Dean of Westminster there could be no better connecting-link between theology and history. Froude, Kinglake, Lecky, Freeman, Green—these in their different departments are each of them writers who would be ornaments to the historical literature of any century. Elaborate studies of special periods, comprehensive

surveys, pictures which bring the past as near and make it as real to us as the present—these are the fruits of our contemporary historians.

Quite recently there has been published a history by Mr. Wyon of the reign of Queen Anne, which is not without much original information and genuine research; while Mr. Spencer Walpole has already produced two volumes of a "History of England," dating from the end of the Peninsular War, that is at once trustworthy, comprehensive, full of social and political interest, and written in a style which suggests much study of Macaulay, and which is at once scholar-like and popular. Mr. Green, who, in the series of primers which he has followed Mr. Freeman in editing, has contributed to the formation of intelligent views on the entire course of history, takes a wider sweep in his short and in his longer "History of the English People," and has collected and arranged an immense mass of miscellaneous facts, with great regard to dramatic grouping. To these works must be added Mr. Justin McCarthy's "History of Our Own Times," a narrative of the chief events of the Victorian era, written not only with finished literary skill, but with great political knowledge and insight. But the most important historical works of the present day are not perhaps the popular. Every age produces its own type of historian. First comes the chronicler of events, who narrates without connecting incidents, and who does not attempt to discover the

thread of continuity that runs throughout the course of human affairs. He is followed by the more thoughtful researcher, who goes beneath the surface and discovers the sequence of principles involved in successive episodes; thus the philosophy of history is made possible, and, as time passes by, it is necessary that history should be re-written repeatedly. The accumulating experiences of humanity throw new light not only on the prospect, but on the retrospect. These experiences are often of a special kind, and they are not to be found unless they are diligently sought for. They are contained not only in great national events, revolutions, and wars, but in archives and records, parliamentary proclamations, decrees, and registers, household accounts and family records. Much of the activity of the present day has been exclusively devoted to unearthing these buried sources of knowledge. The Public Record Office has been publishing for years past a series of most valuable papers which render it necessary to modify many of the views which were once held on such matters as the growth of the English Constitution. To Professor Stubbs belongs pre-eminently the honour not only of having in many cases edited these and collected them, but in having illustrated their full significance, and in having shown what re-construction in our scheme of the early history of England they necessitate.

If the influence of German thought may be seen in much of the theological writing of the day, it

is equally possible to discern the influence of French thought in much of that writing which, so far as it treats of politics and philosophy as affording a practical guide for life, may be considered almost religious. While Sir James Stephen and Mr. Froude illustrate the potency of the doctrines of Carlyle, whose "Hero Worship" has been largely nourished on German materials, Mr. John Morley and Mr. Frederic Harrison are equally noticeable as being exponents of the culture which is essentially French. The sympathy of each is undisguisedly with the men either antecedent to or immediately contemporary with the French Revolution. Mr. John Morley's works on Voltaire, Rousseau, above all, his sympathy with Diderot and the French Encyclopædists, strike the key-note of his practical philosophy. The view which both he and, in his "Order and Progress," Mr. Frederic Harrison take of human society, is exactly that which would have commended itself to these master spirits. "Compromise" is the book which might almost be cited as a compendium of Mr. Morley's philosophy of life. If society is not so much a great growth, whose foundations are rooted in the sentiments, the prejudices, and even the superstitions of past ages, but something that can be eminently and quickly modified from time to time, changing its features with tolerable rapidity at the bidding and by the efforts of eminent individuals, it follows that every man who believes strongly in the falsity of old notions, or in



the truth of the new, is bound to lose no opportunity of energetically expressing his dissent from the bulk of surrounding opinion. Mr. Morley does not, indeed, ignore the historical argument against sudden change, but he appears to think that it is over-rated, and that timidity and indolence exaggerate the difficulties of the process which he advocates. There are two other points to be noticed in the political philosophy which Mr. Morley enforces, with the eloquence of a literary master, and the fervour of a political apostle. In the first place, he does not distinctly tell us when compromise becomes criminal. It is permissible, he says, when the most sacred feelings of family are involved. Surely, this is itself a sanction of compromise, and the great moral of Mr. Morley's book is that a man with strong convictions is bound to express those convictions only when, in his opinion, a convenient season for their expression has arrived. Again, Mr. Morley does not attempt to fix the degree of belief or persuasion at which a man must have arrived before he commences to place limitations upon the habit of compromise; nor perhaps does he give sufficient practical weight to the results of the destructive process, which the conduct he commends would have upon an old and complex society. The standard of practical life which Mr. Morley sets before himself and others is of an exceedingly lofty character, but though love of truth and a fearless pursuit of truth are enough to insure its

realisation in certain exceptional instances, it may very well be that they have not this coercive power with the mass of men, and that men are so constituted, are so much the creatures of fear and hope, that what Mr. Morley himself is persuaded are lies and delusions, are absolutely necessary for them.

The same considerations which would be suggested by a minute examination of the works of George Eliot are also those which present themselves when the tenor of Mr. Morley's counsels is closely scanned. Nothing in theory may sound more plausible than the postponement of self and of family to the idea of mankind, but in practice can it carry with it any guarantee of efficiency? To the bulk of men and women can the welfare and progress of society ever be anything more than ideas? Will it, as the education of the human race advances, be possible for them to deduce their notions of moral duty from a just estimate of the relations of the individual and of the family to society? Is there anything in the past history of the human race to make us think that weak mortals can arrive at a knowledge of their duty to each other unless the elements of that knowledge are culled from a superhuman source? Ideas of duty, it may be urged, have their origin in something else than in the daily intercourse of man, and devotion to society is as inadequate to explain them or to prompt them as utilitarianism is to explain the higher virtues of humanity—heroism, self-sacrifice, martyrdom. When the ends which Mr. Morley and George Eliot admire are advocated, is it not possible that those who advocate

them may be under influences which they ignore? This higher and disinterested morality would surely never have existed without the educating agency of Christianity; and as for what future generations may do without Christianity, is it possible to form any opinion? Will the social morality of compromise or of George Eliot be an end in itself, requiring none of the motives or sanctions implied by Christianity?

But the popular and essentially humanising literature of the day is not to be found in books alone. There is the vast multitude of magazines, serials, and newspapers to be taken into account. Of newspapers, we shall have something to say in a future chapter. Every household, high or humble, has its own monthly or weekly miscellany of instructive and amusing literature. If these encourage desultory reading, it is certain that without them there are hundreds and thousands of English men and women who would read very little, if at all. In the same way the serial issues of great works are many, and exceedingly effective in introducing these works to the public. There are many persons in every class of life who will readily pay a small sum for each number of a large work issued in parts, and who refuse to pay a greater sum for such a work as a substantive whole.

## CHAPTER XXIX.

### POPULAR AMUSEMENTS.

**Change and Multiplied Variety of Popular Amusements—The Travelling Showman and Photographer—The Development of the Excursion System—Scene on the Norfolk Coast—Amusements in the Manufacturing Districts and the Black Country—Music-halls—Museums—Art Exhibitions—Working Men's Clubs—The Institution and its Working described—How to stamp out Drunkenness—The Stage—Change in its Position—The Playgoing Public—Change in Social Position of Actors—The Stage the Mirror of Contemporary Manners—Reasons of its alleged Decadence—Its Realism and Lack of Poetry—Dangers of this Realism—What a Dramatic Censor may prevent—Uses of a Dramatic Censor—Relations of English and French Public to their respective Stages—The English Drama and the Divorce Court—French Plays in England.**

It would be impossible to form a better idea of the advance made by Englishmen of all classes, whether in town or country, in the art of "popular amusement" than from a comparison of the advertisements relating to sports, pastimes, and recreation in a newspaper of to-day with those which made their appearance less than half a century since. One would look in vain now for the announcements of pugilistic encounters arranged between bruisers of established and growing reputation, cock-fights, dog-fights, and performances of terrier dogs, backed for large sums to kill several scores of rats within a limited space and time. One would have looked in vain then for the accounts of cricket-matches, and of the scores made by their players, in different parts of England, which now occupy entire pages of the

sporting journals; for the notices to excursionists that are a regular feature in every newspaper during the summer season; for the miscellaneous programmes of picture exhibitions, lectures, theatres, music-halls, entertainments of all kinds, places of amusement of every variety, which have become an essential part of the machinery of our social life. Within the last five-and-twenty years cricket clubs and football clubs have been formed in all the towns and most of the villages in England. The rifle volunteer movement has presented another opportunity of healthy out-door exercise; athletic sports have been added to our muscular system; open spaces and village greens are the recognised playgrounds of the people. What were formerly wastes have been converted into public gardens. There are people's pleasure-grounds in the East End of London, and scarcely a year passes without an addition being made to the people's parks, which have been given by the bounty of great landlords to the industrial cities of the north.

As it has been with open-air pastimes, so has it been with indoor amusements. In the country the public-house, if still the chief, is not the absolutely paramount and exclusive attraction. There are penny readings, where the voice of the reader is varied by music vocal and instrumental; there are book societies, lectures, and, in many instances, reading-rooms supplied for the benefit of the members—all working men—with a selection of the newspapers of the day. Even the annual fair which, in the adjoining country town, was

the great dissipation of the year, is an institution almost out of date. Human monstrosities fascinate the eye no longer, and invitations to witness the display of bicephalous womanhood inside a canvas booth meet with so cold a response that they are seldom offered. The showman's van, which, a quarter of a century since, collected the whole country side to view its contents, has almost ceased to exist. Neither the eloquence nor the art which once added their never-failing embellishments to this travelling world of wonders would suffice to secure customers or admirers now. The little black silhouettes, standing out in prominent relief against a white background, in which this same thaumaturgist would depict the profile of your countenance for the price of one shilling, is a relic of the past, and the showman's reign ended when that of the photographer began. Now it is the day of the roaming photographer which is itself coming to a close. The proprietors of nomadic exhibitions of every kind complain that business has lamentably fallen off, and though equestrian troupes still manage to gain a living by making periodical pilgrimages through the kingdom, other forms of amusement are accessible all the year round in the immediately contiguous capital of every country district. The cheap trains and railway extension, which have proved the ruin of the old showman, have multiplied indefinitely the opportunities of popular recreation among the peasantry of England.

In the childhood of many a man and woman who are yet barely middle-aged the village feast was the

great rural jubilee, the one universally recognised holiday of the year. There was a substantial dinner, there was a brass band, there were games and dances, cricket and rounders for the boys, and kiss-in-the-ring for Giles and his sweetheart. But as soon as the neighbourhood became accustomed to the snorting and puffing of the steam engine, its old men and women, its young men and maids, took advantage of it to explore the almost unknown world which lay close to them. They were, in the parlance of certain traffic managers, put upon the fidget, and the dividends of railway companies rose in proportion. Just as it was the Exhibition of 1851 from which must be dated the first great steps towards improvement made by English people in art and decorative design, so may the opening of the Crystal Palace at Sydenham be identified with a new departure in the region of popular amusement. The Crystal Palace is at the present day the rendezvous for country parties, which come from all quarters within a radius of fifty or sixty miles from London.

These pilgrimages of pleasure have familiarised the masses with the idea of jaunts taken with the same end in other directions. Our ever-growing railway system has supplied the means, and now the excursion may be said to be one of the chief amusements of our toiling millions. Travel through any part of England on Saturday, Monday, or Tuesday, and you will find that the local lines swarm with villagers going to or returning from the town on missions of business or of pleasure, or, more likely, of both combined. This is

the way in which the money formerly reserved for rustic holidays is disposed of. If those rural pleasure-takers are within a convenient distance of London, to London many of them will go. If not, they put by their savings and spend them on trips to their provincial metropolis.

If one wishes to have a true and graphic idea of what the modern excursion system is, of how great is the hold which it has acquired among the masses, a sight may be mentioned that can be witnessed almost any day in the summer or autumn months upon the Norfolk coast. It is eleven in the forenoon, and the beach is not only tranquil, but almost desolate. Half a dozen fishermen are visible mending their nets or smoking the pipe of moody silence. There is not a sound which blends with the fretting of the waves against the pebbles, unless it be the shrill cry of the sea-bird, or possibly the distant and muffled scream of the whistle of the railway train, audible for many miles over these treeless levels and bleak sand hills. Wait a minute and you shall see what you shall see. It is a quarter-past eleven now, and in twenty minutes' time an excursion train is due at the adjoining station. Presently you are conscious of the murmur of strange arrivals and the bustling note of preparation. You look around and find that upwards of a hundred men have suddenly invaded the place, are setting up booths, furnishing them with eatables and drinkables, are establishing Aunt Sallies, and providing the machinery of other delectable pastimes. In less than fifteen minutes the deserted beach has been transformed,



and what was absolute solitude now presents the appearance of a fair which wants nothing to complete it except the advent of its patrons. Here these patrons are, or presently will be. Puff-puff is the warning sound of the steam engine in the distance, and the wreaths of smoke which for a minute darken the heavens, and then are swept away by the wind, are significant of the cloud of humanity that in a few seconds will settle down upon the shore. Out they troop from the carriages which have just drawn up at the platform—men, women, boys, and children, a good thousand strong. It is likely enough that there are other contingents yet to arrive. The excursionist is a gregarious animal, and the bigger the crowd in which he takes his pleasure the more he enjoys it. It is by no means an uncommon thing to witness the sea coast, on which an hour since not more human beings were visible than could be counted on the fingers of one hand, covered by three thousand human beings, restlessly moving to and fro like the microscopic army of an ant-hill. Fun and frolic reign all day until the moment for departure on the return journey arrives. Then may be observed the reverse of the phenomenon of the morning. Animation is gone almost as quickly as it came. The trains give a few premonitory rumblings and disappear. The last notes of the excursionists' songs die away on the wind; the echoes are undisturbed by peals of laughter; and the hucksters who have waited on the great army of pleasure-seekers pack up their belongings,

fold up their tents like the Arabs, steal away as silently and swiftly as they alighted, and leave the philosopher to reflect in sudden solitude upon the moral of the day's experience.

On the north-west coast of the United Kingdom the development of the excursion system is even more conspicuous than on the east. The manufacturers of the north and the great retailers, who, for the most part, are north-countrymen, cannot be accused of neglecting the social relaxations of those whom they employ. Lytham, Fleetwood, and New Brighton are only a few of the marine resorts of myriads of the operatives let loose from the great towns of northern industry; and if the goal of these is in too many cases the public-house bar rather than the shore of the sea, it is permissible to hope that tobacco-smoke and beer do not entirely neutralise the beneficent agencies of oxygen and ozone. Generally it may be said that the labouring classes in the north of England are better off as regards amusements than in the south. Many great works or factories have attached to them not only reading-rooms, but billiard-rooms and bowling-alleys. When these opportunities are not provided by the employer, they are sometimes secured by the men, who club together, and, applying the principle of co-operation, wisely supersede the attractions of the public-house. Other and more active recreations than these are forthcoming: cricket, wrestling, and every variety of athletic sport enjoy an increasing popularity throughout the whole of the north of England. In the Pottery

Districts, and in the vicinity of Manchester, rabbit-coursing, with a peculiar breed of little greyhound, is much in vogue. With the shoemakers of Northamptonshire—and, indeed, amongst shoemakers of all parts of England—foot-racing is a favourite pastime. The artisans of Birmingham and Coventry rejoice in bicycles. Among the rural and urban toilers of Yorkshire knurr and spell—a species of trap, bat, and ball—still flourishes. In some counties (eminently in Nottinghamshire) wherever there is a fair expanse of level and unoccupied grass land, the wickets are sure to be pitched, and boys and men practise with bat and ball—some of them destined to blossom into professional players—after the day's work is over.

In rural districts there are hundreds of cottagers, now that cottage gardening has received systematic encouragement in special shows for cottage competitors, and that prizes are specially reserved for these at more general horticultural exhibitions, whose spare hours are entirely given to gardening. If one comes to London, it is not necessary to mention Epping Forest as the Arcadia of the artisan of the East End; Ramsgate and Margate as the marine paradises of the multitude; or Battersea Park as the great Sunday lounge of various social subdivisions of the community, from the head clerk down to the junior porter. Naturally in such a climate as ours, the working classes will always find the larger part of their amusement within four walls. Thirty years ago, with the sole exception of the theatre, the only available resort for the masses was the public-house.

We are as completely outliving that state of things as we have outlived the period when "Cross's Menagerie" was one of the great attractions of the Strand, and the skeleton of the whale was the only lion in Trafalgar Square. If there cannot yet be said to have been established an absolute identity between instruction and amusement, the steps actually made in the direction of reform are immense. Music-halls do not spread an atmosphere of pure refinement, and are not without their mischievous influences upon the moral currency, but they are none the less, if properly conducted, antidotes to the popular curse of drunkenness. They exist in every large town in England, and the composition of their audiences presents some features which are not entirely unsatisfactory. It is claimed on behalf of the Frenchman that while there may be no one who is at home so little, there is no one who loves that home so much. He takes, we are told, the influence of the domestic hearth with him whenever he goes abroad. The society, in fact, in which he chiefly moves is an extension of home; and if he is happy, and is really equally at home anywhere, it is because he is not unaccompanied by his wife and children. A very casual study of the company that fills some music-halls, whether in London or elsewhere, will convince one that at least a portion of it consists of genuinely family parties—husbands and wives, fathers, mothers, and one or two of their children. The attempt which is now being made to establish coffee-house music-halls will certainly prove a strong and wholesome antidote to the public-house and the gin-shop.

There are other not less popular recreations of the masses which stand on a much higher level. The statistics and figures published in the newspapers from week to week show how large is the measure of popularity which institutions like the South Kensington Museum, the National Gallery, and others, enjoy. A wider experience than London, unhappily, affords of the working of the free library system is necessary to convey a just idea of the immense boon which free libraries constitute to the working class. Look inside the doors of these establishments in Manchester or Birmingham during the dinner-hour, and note the attention and the evident enjoyment with which the artisans are reading, not novels only, but the classics of English literature and the manuals of modern science. Add to the free libraries the working men's clubs, and a fair idea may be formed of the character and extent of the humanising machinery that is already at work amongst the masses throughout the length and breadth of the land.

The working man's club is an institution not only from a political point of view harmless, but in its social aspect eminently beneficent. It is, too, an institution which is representative of a growing class. There may be a score of such clubs for working men in London, and they are to be found in every considerable town in England. In some cases there is no mention of political principles of any kind in the club rules. In others, the political cause with which the society is identified is Conservative or Liberal; the

programme in a majority of instances being of a decidedly Liberal and even democratic complexion. Yet how groundless are any apprehensions as to the constitutional peril latent in these professions may be judged from a glimpse at the interior life of the club, and a comparison between its ostensible objects and its practical functions. The institution which we will now visit, and which may be taken as typical of many others, has been in existence about half a dozen years. It has nearly six hundred members, all of whom, without exception, are *bonâ fide* working men—some small masters, some highly-skilled mechanics making £3 or £4 a week, others whose weekly wage is from 25s. to 30s. The admission to the club is by ballot among members of the committee, and any conduct which is offensive, or which threatens the harmony of the institution, is punished as severely and after the same fashion—by expulsion—as “conduct unworthy of a gentleman” would be in one of the co-operative palaces of Pall Mall or St. James’s Street. The subscription is about 15s. a year, and it has lately been decided that visitors’ refreshments must be paid for by the friends who introduce them—a rule which adds to the radical difference between these establishments and the public-house.

This is the chief room of the building: a spacious hall for debate, with a stage at one end for occasional dramatic entertainments. Immediately adjoining it is a smaller chamber furnished with a refreshment buffet, from which all visitors are rigorously excluded. If our

visit happens to be during the hours of daylight the place will be deserted but for the presence of a few stray members, clad in their working dress, who have lounged in during the dinner-hour to read the papers. In the billiard-room, the bagatelle-room, the chess-room, the refreshment-room, the reading-room, there may also be found one or two mechanics who are taking a holiday, or who are perhaps out of work. The reading-room is seldom absolutely empty. Like the other apartments, it opens out of the central hall, is well supplied with the chief newspapers of the day, with various organs of different trades and industries, not only English, but American, and in a few cases German and French, and has in addition a fair library. The works of John Stuart Mill are there, while those of Thomas Carlyle for the most part are not. The writings of another obscure heresiarch of a former generation, of a name of similar sound but different orthography, Carlisle, are prominently visible on the shelves. There, too, are the books whose authors are Herbert Spencer, Thomas Hare, Lecky, and Buckle; while there is a multitude of publications whose titles have a strange sound to English ears, but which have won great popularity on the Transatlantic continent. The room is further ornamented with portraits of certain more advanced members of the House of Commons, distinguished patrons of the Republican cause on the Continent, and notably a picture of George Washington and his family, which has been sent as a present to the club

from a group of sympathetic working men on the other side of the Atlantic.

As the day draws to its close the club begins gradually to fill. Here are the representatives of all the industries which have their head-quarters in great cities. They come in their workaday dress, yet not without having paid some special preliminary attention to their personal appearance. They have been home, have gone through a simple toilette, have had their tea, and a rasher of bacon with it, have probably smoked the pipe of domestic peace, and have not forgotten to say good-night to the little ones in bed. They want change of scene and conversation, and they get it at their club. They read, smoke, and chat by turns. There is sure to be some discussion in the great hall on some topic of the day. One member reads a short paper, let it be supposed, on the necessity of protection, or the justice of reciprocity, to native trade, or direct representation of the interests of labour in Parliament. A debate follows, and much of the speaking which may be heard is surprisingly good. Sometimes there are visitors. An American or German operative narrates his experiences to his guests, or a gentleman who takes an interest in working men and their doings addresses them on the subject of his travels in foreign parts, or acquaints them with his views on matters nearer home. On Sunday night a kind of grand field-day of the club is held. There is always a lecture; the topics suggested are infinitely various, conveying much valuable instruction. The theme chosen is



seldom suited to the sanctity of the day; the moral pointed would not always commend itself to the political quietist. Be that as it may, it is certainly better that these men should be in their clubs than at the public-houses or the gin-shops. If drunkenness is ever stamped out from among the English working classes it will be largely due to the agency of such institutions as these. It is not Utopian to believe that clubs may, in course of time, and as education advances, do for labouring men what they have already done for the upper classes, and render open intoxication a barbarous anachronism. As they have created among the upper classes a public opinion which is unfavourable to excess, so wherever they exist among the lower classes we find them doing, or tending to do, the same good work. It is beginning to be recognised that the man who is drunk is, for the time being, not only a brute, but a nuisance.

Whatever may be the condition or the prospects of the drama in England, there can be no doubt as to its claim to be considered a popular institution, or as to the fact that for an increasingly large number of persons the stage supplies the chief, if not the only, culture which they know. The theatre has become in London not merely an occasional amusement, but a regular pursuit. Among classes socially quite distinct and different the chief idea of an evening's amusement is an evening at the play. One finds it at the East End, where the same persons repair nightly to witness over and over again the same

performance. The same phenomenon meets one at the West, where the theatre is not only a place in which to sit still and laugh or wonder, according as the spirit of comedy or tragic awe is in the ascendant, but a lounge where cigarettes may be smoked, friends met and chatted with, and the news of the evening obtained. This is an importation of Continental usages into England within the last decade. Evenings at home are enjoyable and admirable in their way, but how many tens of thousands are there in London and other large cities who have evenings to spare but no home in particular at which to spend them, not to mention the daily influx of casual visitors from the country, or of sojourners *en route* for India or the colonies, or of Americans of passage to and from the Continent? There is, further, a large percentage of young men sufficiently well-to-do, who, if they have their offices in the day, and their chambers and clubs at night, are not overburdened with social engagements, and may, perhaps, prefer the independence of the play-house to the hospitable constraints of a decorous dinner-table. With these the theatre is not the least important business of their lives. There is not a new piece which is produced that they miss. They are seldom absent on first nights. They know the critics by sight. They belong probably to some one or other of the minor literary or dramatic clubs. They skim the newspapers of the morning and evening, but serious study is not to their taste, and the theatre is.

There is little or nothing in common between the modern playgoer and the ancient enthusiast in the classic days of the Patent Houses. The cheap enjoyment of that period he would vote vulgar. He has no idea of waiting a couple of hours outside the pit door, and then fervently congratulating himself if he has secured a seat well in front of the stage. When the play is over, it is not with stout and oysters that he will refresh his inner man. On the contrary, he has conformed to the modern type of exquisite. He makes a point of appearing in full evening dress. He never touches supper: it hurts his digestion. He is afraid of stout: it is the declared enemy of his liver. The place which the theatre fills in the mind of society at large is equally remarkable. Together with old china and new pictures, it divides polite conversation in drawing-rooms and at dinner-tables. It is considered quite as necessary to go to see the last new play as the last new opera. Even society's conception of the calling and personality of the actor has undergone a complete change. Directly or indirectly, clubs have done a great deal to bridge over the gulf that once existed between classes. If they have not promoted what is called good fellowship, they have at least done the important service of bringing representatives of different orders of men into close and friendly intercourse. The actor is above all others a clubable man. The hours which he is compelled to keep make club life particularly convenient to him; and when he is at his club he finds himself in a circle which includes men with whom thirty years ago it is not very

likely that he would have been on speaking terms. The comparatively intimate relationship which has been established between society and the stage has had its influence on both parties to the arrangement. The influence of the stage upon society does not end here. Private theatricals may satisfy a trivial ambition: there are eager natures which require something more stirring; for these are the excitements of the public audience. Thus do we hear of amateur pantomimes and *matinées* at fashionable playhouses in the Strand.

That the stage is not at the present time a vehicle for the inculcation of the higher morality, and that, as matters are, it is not likely to be, must be confessed. The relaxation of public manners which has been in process in this country during several years is reflected by the footlights, and in the pieces which attain popularity behind them. Paris has been, and remains, the capital of dramatic art or invention, as well as the resort of all the idlers and demireps of Europe. Of late years, the facilities of locomotion and the whims of fashion have cemented the connection between London and Paris, and the influences exercised upon our social system by the Second Empire are still rampant. It is not only our plays, but in some cases our domestic ethics, which are taken from the French—of the Boulevards; and if the spirit of the age tolerates the lowest standard of Parisian morality, it is not surprising that the plays, which are the presentations of this morality, should be popular in English theatres. Something like an analogy, too, may be traced between a London and a Paris audience.

French domestic life is not represented in the crowds that fill the smaller theatres of the French capital; English domestic life is represented almost as little in some of the theatres of London. Prominent among the patrons of the London stage are uncritical visitors from the provinces and the not too refined members of our new plutocracy. There are other reasons which can scarcely make us expect to find any very elevated exemplar of morals or manners on the London stage. We dine later and we work harder than ever, and the state of body and mind which these habits superinduce is scarcely favourable to the highest sort of intellectual appreciation. Again, free trade in theatres—an absurd confusion of industry and art—has dispersed the few good actors that we had, has destroyed a school of acting, and has made room on the stage for some of the crapulous buffooneries of the music-hall. Indeed, while the music-hall is a grade above the gin-shop, it is the curse of the stage. It vitiates and debases managers, actors, audiences alike. As a consequence, it is but too likely that were the Act of Parliament for regulating theatres repealed the result would be, not the conversion of music-halls into theatres, but of theatres into music-halls. There are, perhaps, now more tolerably good actors on the English boards than at any other period; on the other hand, there are very few actors who can be called great, and the tolerably good actors are quite incapable of representing the heroic or poetic drama. Their elocutionary powers are defective, and they are not happy even in their attempted recitals of blank

verse. As for a subsidised national theatre, it must be pronounced an impossibility in England; nor should it be forgotten that the Comédie Française is not merely a subsidised theatre, but also an incorporated and endowed collegiate institution, having in some sort its exhibitors, its fellowships, its statutes, privileges, and pensions.

“La foule,” says Jules Claretie, “est ainsi faite qu’elle s’en va payer—et parfois tres cher—pour admirer dans un théâtre ce qu’elle peut librement, et à bon marché contempler dans la rue.” The most striking feature of our modern drama is its abject realism. This is not a credulous, a poetic, a chivalrous, or enthusiastic age. As is the age so is the theatre-going public, and so is the theatre itself. We do not want impossible feats of ennobled heroism. We want to see life as it is—life sometimes as it exists in St. Giles’s, at others as it exists in Mayfair or St. James’s Street. We demand that actors and actresses shall give us the best imitations they can of the ladies and gentlemen who meet daily in Hyde Park; who talk, laugh, and flirt together; who make love, and unmake marriages; who go to Hurlingham; who dine at the Orleans Club. We pretend no high motive in all this, and aim at no particular moral. We simply wish to be amused, and we wish also to witness what we call a *mise-en-scène* so perfect that we may enjoy some faint illusion into the bargain. As the coats and dresses of the ladies and gentlemen on the stage are made by the same tailors and milliners who make the coats and dresses of the ladies and gentlemen

in society, so do we expect that the furniture shall be an exact likeness of that seen in the drawing-rooms of the West End. If old English decorations and Queen Anne architecture are the vogue in real life, we must have them on the stage. There must be left nothing to the imagination, and unless the eye and ear can immediately see it all, it is not supposed to be there. The more familiar the scene the better. There is nothing which brings down the house like a view of Waterloo Bridge, especially if a hansom cab happens to be going over it; or the counterfeit presentment of Hyde Park Corner by lamplight, especially if Piccadilly happens to be enlivened by the gay and festive presence of some young gentlemen who have taken too much wine, whose opera hats are crushed in, whose white ties are all awry, and who are going home with the milk. Arcadia may be all very well; but the most beautiful glimpse of Arcadian forests and streams which scenic artist ever gave would not provoke a tenth part of the applause that a clever portrayal of Richmond Hill, with the "Star and Garter" in the immediate foreground, and Eel Pie Island in the middle distance, never fails to elicit. A view of the Bay of Naples, with Herculaneum and Pompeii visible, would be all very well; but what is it to Brighton, with the green-and-gold ironwork of the Grand Hotel?

These tastes are not peculiar to the playgoing public or exclusively gratified on the stage. The same thing may be witnessed in much of our pictorial art and in most of our popular novels. What the late Mr.

Thomas Robertson, the author of *Society, Caste*, and the rest of what are known as the "Prince of Wales' dramas," was to the modern drama, Mr. Anthony Trollope is to contemporary romance. The novelist must follow the example of the playwright, and give us life as it is. On the stage the hero asks for a cigarette; in the novel the young lady asks her lover for a stamp. The first consideration in every department of intellectual industry or activity is not to fly too high for the public. The dramatist may write his dramas with a quill which comes from the wing of the angel Gabriel, but if he writes above the heads of his patrons, woe be to him. The romantic and historic drama has given place to the "cup and saucer" domestic drama, and there is no reason to suppose that public taste and morals are much the worse or better for the change. But what is a harmless realism among the higher classes may conceivably become a very dangerous realism if gratified in the case of the lower. It is a simple historical fact, that a few years ago a London manager\* was actually contemplating the production of the Ober Ammergau Passion Play upon the stage of his theatre, and had he not received timely warning from the responsible authority the experiment would certainly have been made. Again, early in the month of December, 1875, it was announced on a series of yellow and black posters,

\* There is, of course, no reference here to the advertised Tableaux at the Westminster Aquarium in 1878. The interposition of authority was not called for in this instance, the Ober Ammergau peasants never having accepted any engagement in England, and the representation of the Tableaux not having been announced to take place at the Royal Aquarium Theatre—the only part of the building under the Lord Chamberlain's jurisdiction.



fixed upon every available vacant space in the town of Sunderland, that a startling drama of real life was to be produced, founded on certain incidents in the life of Henry Wainwright, who was then lying in the condemned cell under sentence of death for the murder of his paramour! The first act was to have Broxbourne Gardens as its *venue*, and in the course of it the audience were to be made acquainted with "the first meeting between Wainwright and his victim; the arts employed by men about town; the friendly warning disregarded." Amongst the scenes which followed were "high jinks in the Whitechapel Counting House," a "life of wild dissipation," the "murder," and much else. If this hideous farrago of criminal tableaux, rendered articulate with criminal speeches and vicious sentiments, had been actually given to the public, who can doubt that it would have exercised a directly debasing and pernicious influence? The public know what is permitted, but not what is prevented.

Such experiences as these show that the Licensor of Plays has other duties to perform than the interdiction of clumsy adaptations of unwholesome French dramas, or obscene French farces. There is but one commandment in the Decalogue that is a source of unfailing capital to the Parisian playwright. The same sin, implied or expressed, perpetrated already, or with events apparently leading up to its perpetration, is ever there. His ingenuity is devoted to varying the conditions of the offence, inventing new combinations of offenders, placing them in novel

situations, and illustrating the Nemesis which, sooner or later, overtakes the guilty in diverse shapes. Sometimes the action of the avenging deity assumes the form of laughter-moving satire, sometimes of overwhelming tragedy. There are farcical comedies in which the unholy conspirator against the peace of households is depicted as merely ridiculous, the dupe of his own villainy, a knave, and, as events turn out, a fool into the bargain. There are, on the other hand, comedies, such as the *Supplice d'une Femme*, which are traversed by a vein of very tragic purpose, and which display the consequence of matrimonial perfidy in the agonising aspects of lifelong and irreparable remorse. Now these dramas stand in a relation to French audiences and to French society radically different from that which it is possible they should occupy towards English audiences and English society. With scarcely an exception, even our best actors and actresses lack the *finesse* and the lightness of touch which are the attributes, in a special degree, of their French brethren and sisters. They are without that eminently Parisian art of swiftly and gracefully gliding over delicate and dangerous ground. Though the situations in a play should be subordinate to the moral, the moral is still one thing and the situations another. The real and unavoidable danger when English actors are intrusted with the performance of a play whose spirit, conception, and situation are thoroughly French, is that they should exaggerate the situations at the expense of the moral—should bring the former into disproportionate

prominence, and should dwarf and obscure the latter. The final moral, from a French point of view, may be unexceptionable, but the situations are worse than hazardous, and, acted as such dramas are likely to be acted in England, the temptation to an English audience to fasten on the situations and forget the moral would be irresistible.

There are other reasons which cause dramas that are perfectly possible and not glaringly improper in France to be wholly unadaptable to English audiences. If the sanctity of the marriage tie is not always respected in England, the general terms on which the sexes are associated with each other before and after marriage are entirely different on the two sides of the Channel. In France flirtation is supposed to be the common successor of marriage; in England it is at least considered theoretically more desirable that it should precede the ceremony. A very considerable proportion of the English novels read by young ladies who are not yet brides—which are mainly the products of feminine hands, and abound in warmly-coloured love passages—would be considered quite as inappropriate or improper for a French maiden as the *polissonneries* of the French stage are for an English maiden. The *cavalier servente*, the wife's lover, may have an existence in England, but he has not a definite status as in France, and the adaptations of French plays in which he figures to the English stage are not faithful or acceptable pictures of English society. Finally, it is to be borne in mind that the institution of a Divorce

Court in the one country, and the absence of such an institution in the other, will cause the public of each to regard the presentation in a dramatic shape of conjugal treason and traitors with very different sentiments. The published records of the court over which Sir James Hannen presides acquaint Englishmen and Englishwomen with the misery that follows systematic breaches of what is not in this country a sacrament, but a civil contract, in all its vulgar and prosaic hideousness. Faithlessness in husbands and wives is not in England, as in France, merely a moral sin to be satirised by turning the laugh against the betrayer: it is a legal offence, and it admits of a legal remedy. It is surely as sorry to jest with the iniquity which may be punished with a heavy pecuniary mulct, and a scandalous publicity, in a division of a High Court of Justice, as with the fate that overtakes an apprentice who dips his hand into his master's till, or the scamp who terminates his career by forging a friend's name.

If the general English public were able to protect itself in these matters, or if English theatrical managers could be trusted never to take advantage of its defencelessness and folly, then Parliament might be petitioned to repeal forthwith the Act under which the Licenser of Plays holds his office. But few, if any, managers sufficiently bear in mind that many pieces which have succeeded in Paris have not been exclusively, or even mainly, patronised by the French middle class, but by the floating population of pleasure-seeking foreigners, of whom Paris is always full. Again, theatres

are labelled and classified in Paris to a degree in which they are not, and cannot be, in London. If one goes to the Palais Royal, to the Bouffes, the Variétés, one knows in each case precisely what to expect. In London, on the other hand, the audiences in all our theatres are mixed; and the most respectable mother and father of a family are apt to assume that there is no temple of the drama to which they may not safely resort with children and friends. Further, it has been in past times the policy of French Governments to render the theatre a place of distraction from politics for the French people, and so long as the end was gained the means employed were not too minutely inquired into. The specious argument which is sometimes employed, that if a censorship of the stage is desirable a censorship of the press also would at least be justified, admits of an easy and conclusive answer. The *raison d'être* of a censorship of the stage in countries where the press and all other forms of literary publication are absolutely free is to be found in the essential difference between what is read and what is represented. The *Police News* and other journals of that description are not edifying sheets. But it is possible that their perusal does no permanent injury to some, at least, of their patrons. Imagine, however, the dramatic representation of the scenes and incidents portrayed in an illustrated print of the character of the *Police News*. The peculiar influence of dramatic representations depends upon the contagious sympathy of a crowd. The effect produced upon an individual has to be

enlarged and intensified indefinitely before any idea can be arrived at as to the nature of the total impression upon the aggregate multitude. The wild plaudits of the collective occupants of the pit and gallery come to the ears of each one present with a force that is exactly proportioned to the numerical total of the audience and to the complete volume of irresponsible voices.

The jurisdiction of the Lord Chamberlain of Her Majesty's Household for the time being, as Licensor of the metropolitan theatres, and of all new stage-plays intended for representation at any theatre in Great Britain, is a curious and interesting survival. It is sometimes loosely described as an anomaly; but it is an anomaly only in the sense in which the growth and permanence of our whole constitutional system is an anomaly. Such anomalies preserve us from the logic and the falsehood of extremes, from the opposite but equally oppressive inquisitions of a jealous despotism and of a jealous democracy. In France the dramatic censorship was never so severe as when the censorship was formally abolished—that is, during the Reign of Terror under the First Republic. In countries where no formal censorship exists, the interference of an arbitrary (and not always incorruptible) police is by no means an enviable alternative. In England the unscrupulous managers who would prefer absolute licence, tempered by occasional police-raids, are probably those who would desire to introduce into their theatres the entertainments and the manners of music-halls and

casinoes, and who, therefore, naturally gravitate to Scotland Yard. It may be doubted whether, as the basis of government becomes more and more democratic, the supervision of public entertainments will not become more rather than less exacting and severe.

Some reason for this assumption may be found in the historical antecedents of the Lord Chamberlain's authority over theatres. It is altogether a mistake to suppose that the Act of George II., introduced and passed by the Ministry of Sir Robert Walpole, establishing a censorship of dramatic representations and placing it under the Lord Chamberlain, was the beginning of that great officer of State's theatrical jurisdiction. The truth is, that before the great Puritan Revolution, which closed all theatres and swept many of the poor players into the armies of the king, the two or three dramatic companies that existed were under the express protection of the sovereign. In those days stage-players were looked upon as "rogues and vagabonds," and they were glad enough to escape the ignominy of outcasts by being nominated and appointed "His Majesty's Servants," and provided with royal liveries. The functions subsequently entrusted to the Lord Chamberlain were in those days performed by the Master of the Revels, who was the examiner of all theatrical entertainments. After the Restoration the surviving players of the Puritan period, and their successors, were glad enough to take refuge once more under the patronage of the Court, and to be numbered again among "His Majesty's Servants." The Act of

George II. (revealed by the Act 6 and 7 Victoria) was nothing more than a legislative enactment and sanction of that authority which had previously belonged to the royal prerogative. It was certainly no disgrace to the players to be treated as one of the liberal professions, and to be placed like the Church, the Bar, and the naval and military services, under the control of a great officer of State. But with that happy adaptation of old prerogative to modern liberty which characterises so many "anomalous" English institutions, the supervision of the Lord Chamberlain over theatres or dramatic representations is really exercised by a deputy, who by his condition and experience as a man of the world and by his sympathies as a man of liberal education, of art, of "letters," is likely to exercise the delicate and difficult discretion of a censor (who it must be remembered is a responsible administrator of an Act of Parliament) at once with a due sense of the close relation of public manners to public morals, and of the influence of dramatic representations on public manners, and with a sensitive regard for the just rights and liberties of dramatic literature and dramatic art. In point of fact, neither dramatic literature nor dramatic art has ever had cause to complain of an authority which has been felt as a censorship only by those lawless managers who would turn theatres into houses of ill fame. Oddly enough, the most severe of censors—even to absurdity—was himself a dramatic author, and not a squeamish one, George Colman. There is no denying that the stage in this country,



quite apart from foreign influences, has never quite recovered from the fanatical hostility of Puritanism and from the libertinism of the Restoration, which was a reaction from Puritanical excesses. It is the business of our dramatic "censor" in these days to guard it alike from mere fanaticism and from its own besetting sins in an opposite direction. And on the whole, it may be said that this invidious responsibility is satisfactorily fulfilled.

The abolition of a dramatic censorship thus gently and generously exercised would almost certainly open the door on the stage to the offensive personalities and the scarcely veiled sedition which, as matters are, cannot be kept out of a good many of the popular periodicals of the day. As a consequence, the theatres might be expected to become the scenes of riot and disturbance. Detectives in disguise would be quartered about, the stage would fall into disrepute, and English liberty would be in real danger of serious abridgment. If it is said that the English public is at bottom respectable, and in the long run may be trusted to make its respectability prevail, the answer is that the dramatic censor helps these respectable persons, in the first instance, towards a result that they might only achieve with difficulty after some delay, and after their good taste and moral sense had sustained a considerable outrage. Such an officer is not likely, in point of ethical severity, to be much superior to the general standard of his time. A Puritanic censor of plays would only be possible when Puritanism was the

recognised ruling influence of the day. If the English public is—as it undoubtedly is—for the most part highly respectable, the stage censor reflects their respectability and the good sense which that respectability generates; and in doing this, he may do also not a little to help the decent many to resist the despotism which an indecent few might not be sorry to establish.

With regard to some farcical comedies which have been denounced as objectionable, it may be argued that it is a mistake, even on high moral grounds, to take such performances too seriously. After all, a theatre is not a church or a chapel. As long as there is genuine drollery and genuine laughter there is not much harm done. Nothing is so dull as indecency, nothing the attractions of which are so soon exhausted. But the dialogue of a piece may be harmless, and yet on the stage it may be rendered vicious by the by-play, business, and “gag” of vicious actors. Ever since dramatic art has existed, the comedy of manners and of character has abounded in intrigue, as tragedy has mainly resorted to the collisions between passion and duty. For dramatic purposes the Decalogue has always been more honoured in the breach than the observance. Indeed, if the Decalogue were always universally observed, the occupation of both stage and pulpit would be gone. The Church, fortified by tremendous sanctions, rebukes vice, and scares it away by the terrors of the wrath to come. The play catches the conscience of an audience by tragic terror and pity, or chastises vice by ridicule. An audience of men and

women of the world may be laughed out of their vices at the theatre; they cannot be preached out of them.

As regards the production of French plays upon the English stage, it is a delusion to suppose that more than a very limited number of playgoers in London know enough of the French language genuinely to enjoy them. The boxes and stalls are filled by an exceedingly select public, while the pit and gallery are sparsely occupied by hairdressers and cooks. The occupants of the former part of the house are either attracted by a genuine admiration for French histrionic art, or by the instinct of a prevailing desire to be a stranger to nothing that is Parisian and French. The performers are French, the language employed is French; and if the Examiner of Plays licenses in the original language a farce or a drama which he might be slow to sanction in English adaptation, he has right and reason on his side. To borrow an expression from the domain of international law, the stage censor will scarcely err if he gives French plays performed in London a kind of extra-territorial privilege—if, in fact, he treats the stage on which they are presented as for the time being a part of France projected by accident into England. At the close of these observations on the contemporary English stage, there may be briefly noticed a question often heard among playgoers—Is a revival of Shakespearian dramas in England more probable than a revival of the classic drama in France? With less hesitation than reluctance we

### POPULAR AMUSEMENTS.

must candidly confess our belief that it is not. All those existing conditions of the stage and of society to which reference has been made in this chapter point to one conclusion, which a flash of fashionable enthusiasm for a single actor of originality and distinction, whose principal and most popular successes have been won in modern realistic drama and in modern comedy, confirms rather than contradicts. The more Shakespeare's plays are read, the less, perhaps, will they be represented. An audience sufficiently cultivated to enjoy the plays as literature, to taste the quality of the poet's language, and the subtlety of his thought, will be proportionately less disposed to tolerate the personation of all but one or two characters in the piece by actors such as Hamlet describes in his advice to the players.

## CHAPTER XXX.

### PROFESSIONAL ENGLAND.

General View of English Professions—Civil Engineering—The Bar: Qualifications for Success—Money Prizes of Bar—Tendencies of the Time reflected in English Professional Life—New Professions called into Existence—How Science, Commerce, Art, Literature, have each enlarged the Area of English Professional Life—Schoolmastering as a Profession—Opportunities of Scientific Teaching—Manual *v.* Intellectual Occupation—The Medical Profession—The Country Doctor—General Practitioners and Pure Physicians—Income of London Medical Men—Devotion of Medical Men to Scientific Study—Progress of Medicine in England—Politics as a Profession—Necessity of Money—The Diplomatic Profession—The Foreign Office—The Army—Its Popularity: Growth of the Professional Soldier—Effect of Abolishing Purchase—Mess Expenses.

It is with English professions in the last quarter of the nineteenth century as it is with the various other aspects of our national life which have been passed successively in review. One is confronted on the one hand by the manifest increase of all that is comprised under the head of organisation, and on the other by those signs of flux and movement which indicate that the future and final development of professional England is as yet undecided. To the former of these categories may be referred the machinery of preliminary tests and qualifying examinations; to the latter, the indistinctness of the demarcating line between pursuits and trades on the one hand, and what are specifically styled professions on the other. In all the occupations of modern life there is an

increasing demand for stringent guarantees of efficiency. Physicians and surgeons, barristers and solicitors, soldiers and sailors, are each of them called upon to furnish strong *prima facie* proof of fitness for their career before they are able even in name to embark upon it. If to these we add clergymen, we shall have enumerated the chief traditional departments of English professional life. Yet what nearly innumerable and often anonymous varieties of honourable and profitable occupations will there not be left behind? Though in this chapter it will be necessary to dwell almost exclusively upon the conventional professional divisions, it would be an unpardonable omission to ignore the fact that the limit separating the mechanical industry from the profession seems very often purely arbitrary.

At the head of all the new professions must be placed that of the civil engineer. The calling is pre-eminently that created by the most distinctively characteristic achievements and aspirations of the age, while it opens up a vista of rich rewards to those who follow it with the success which special aptitude and industry command. There is also reason to believe that the profession of the civil engineer is one which appeals with peculiar force to the imagination and ambition of the youth of the day. It is the pioneer of progress and civilisation, moral and material, all the world over; it gratifies that adventurous instinct which is the heritage of the English race. The civil engineer who spans

rocky defiles, pierces mountains, unites continents, and by designing new schemes of railway and telegraphic extension annihilates space and time, is the modern representative of the navigator of the Elizabethan era — of the Hawkinses, Raleighs, Drakes, and Davises, who sailed over remote seas in quest of new lands and fresh enemies to subjugate. The head master of a large public school recently observed to the present writer that three out of every four of his pupils would, if polled, declare for engineering. In other directions, too, the advance of science has greatly enlarged the horizon of English professional life. Scientific farming is surely entitled to rank as a profession. And how is one correctly to speak of the whole race of scientific specialists if not as members of a profession? Experts in naval architecture, chemists, geologists, and others, have all in reality as definite a profession as the medical man, the lawyer, or the divine. Every department of skilled industry, mechanical or intellectual, has annexed to it, so to speak, a considerable specialist business of its own. The development of commerce has been the opportunity for creating a host of occupations, some of which have been glanced at in preceding chapters. Art has proved scarcely less productive in its way than science and commerce. There is not only more work for painters of creative genius than ever, but for a class of artists who never existed before—decorators and designers of all kinds and in all materials. In literature the same movement has, or will have soon,

been experienced, and journalism has certainly acquired a true professional status.

But though the exigencies of modern life, co-operating with the principle of the subdivision of labour, have multiplied professions in England, they have not multiplied them in such number as to provide sufficient occupation for the sons of English parents. The opportunities of an empire established in each of the four quarters of the globe are found too few, or not remunerative enough, for British lads who have to make their own way in life, and who have small capital on which to commence. Success in the learned professions is denied to mediocrities. The navy requires strong interest, and the army a competence. If the developments of British commerce have created a host of new and lucrative callings, there are more candidates already than work can be found for, while the peculiar aptitudes which the occupation demands are not always forthcoming. The Bar means starvation and idleness to the majority of those who are "called." The Civil Service is underpaid, and the meanest position in it is only to be won after success in an examination sufficiently difficult to act as a formidable barrier. The Church offers small inducement for the ambitious aspirant, and the profession of the schoolmaster is already overstocked.

These are the complaints which one hears, and is likely for some while to come to hear, on every side. The professions which naturally suggest themselves to the two thousand young men who



annually take their degrees at Oxford and Cambridge, a majority of whom are dependent for their livelihood on their own exertions, are the Bar, the Church, education, or, possibly, civil engineering. If high academic honours have been taken by the newly-fledged graduate, his path is tolerably clear. He will, in all probability, win a fellowship, which if not tenable for life, will support him for a certain number of years while he is making a start. He may either attempt to live on the stipend attached to this distinction, or he may, residing in the university, supplement his income with work done in his college as fellow and tutor, or take private pupils, or he may accept a position as schoolmaster; or he may go to London, instal himself in chambers, and woo success at the Bar. If he elects the last he will not necessarily find his scholastic honours of any direct assistance to him. Clients will not come, nor will solicitors trust him, more readily because he is a double first, an Ireland Scholar, a Senior Classic, or a Chancellor's Medallist. The chances are, it will be a more appreciable advantage to him to have distinguished himself in the cricket field, on the river, or in the racquet court. For one attorney who recognises that he is a fellow of his college, and the most accomplished scholar of his year, half a dozen will hasten to identify him with the famous stroke in the university eight, or the irresistible bowler who took all the wickets of the rival academic team at Lord's.

Success at the Bar depends on a combination of circumstances, and on a variety of gifts, physical quite as much as mental. A good presence, an agreeable manner, are as valuable as the powerful, but slowly moving intellect. In common law, plausibility, aplomb, and ignorance of what timidity or nervousness mean are indispensable. In addition to this, there should be, if possible, some connection with a few influential solicitors, or the opportunity of establishing such, and then if most of these conditions are forthcoming, there will be the certainty of a moderate success. The personnel of English lawyers is gradually experiencing a change. The examinations that now precede the call to the Bar ensure not only some degree of general culture, but a fair amount of legal knowledge. Hence no lawyer who is a barrister can be—as in the old days, when nothing beyond attendance at the chambers of a pleader or counsel was required—entirely ignorant of law. The university graduate is absolved from the necessity of submitting himself to those merely educational tests, which are imposed in the case of other candidates, many of whom are the sons or brothers of solicitors, while some have been solicitors themselves. Even the university graduate who has taken high honours occasionally recognises the expediency of acquiring some purely technical education by apprenticing himself to a firm of solicitors before he addresses himself to the business of the barrister. Hence, the Bar is much

less of a professional lounge than formerly. There are fewer idlers within the precincts of the Inns of Court, and most of the young gentlemen who keep their terms intend to work, and to win every prize which the profession affords.

The Law List for 1879 shows that there are or there were 5,000 barristers; and a writer in a magazine,\* placing in juxtaposition with these figures several other facts and statistics, draws some interesting conclusions. Estimating the total of fees paid in the High Court of Justice and the different Courts of Quarter Sessions for the year 1878 at £338,200, and dividing this sum by the number of barristers whose names are in the Law List, the magazinist arrives at an average income for each of £68. Adding to this sum the fees paid in County Courts for Indian, colonial, and Scotch appeals, and by law students to tutors, the writer computes the total of revenue to average £100 a head. But, he argues, the expenditure on the necessities of life or of the profession by the barrister cannot be less than £187 a year. Hence he is left with a deficit of £87. Now the money prizes of the profession—the Lord Chancellorship, the other law officers of the Crown, the judges, &c.—are fixed in round numbers at £500,000, which yields another £100 a year to each of the five thousand candidates. This is an interesting and ingenious speculation, but not one of much practical value. It does, however, circumstantially suggest the undoubted fact that the prizes of the Bar are not many

\* The *Gentleman's Magazine*, "The Bar as a Trade." May, 1879.

in number. It is unnecessary to say that, such as they are, they are distributed among comparatively few competitors. Here, as elsewhere, honours and the rewards of business have a tendency to concentrate themselves in the hands of a small minority. One success brings another, and the prosperous barrister has no sooner enough to do than he has too much. Generally it may be said that if a young man makes up his mind to succeed at the Bar, he must see his way to being something of a specialist. Let him master some particular department or branch of law, be known as an expert in a certain sort of cases, and he will have an infinitely better chance than if he takes his stand simply upon the basis of general utility.

In a measure this remark is equally true of all professions at the present time. Let us take the case of the university graduate, in fair, but not in the highest honours, who is thrown upon the world, with a few college debts, and fewer pounds in his pocket. Unless he goes into the Church, or wins a berth in the Civil Service, or finds some chance opening, such as a secretaryship, a private tutorship, or makes his mark on the press, there is but one thing he can do if he is to be a self-supporting institution; he must adopt the profession of schoolmaster. Of the young men who have gone through an academic course, without discredit but without lustre, the great majority become curates, or schoolmasters, or emigrants. The mere university degree, even when accompanied by moderate honours, is becoming a drug in the market. As regards emigra-

tion, experience seems to show that a young man who makes his home in one of the great British colonies, may do fairly well upon either of two assumptions—that he has a certain amount of capital, between £500 and £1,000, to start him, that he is willing to turn his hand to anything, and that one hour he can teach boys ciphering, and writing, and Latin grammar, and the next be making himself generally useful. If he elects to be a schoolmaster in England, he may indeed ultimately attain wealth, but that will not be as schoolmaster, but as keeper of a school boarding-house. Even the pedagogic career no longer presents all its former opportunities. Of course the impetus given in the last few years to education has resulted in a greater demand for schoolmasters. But then while there is a larger supply than ever, the material wanted is not always that which Oxford and Cambridge supply. The demand for the instruments of scientific instruction is increasingly greater than that for the instruments of literary instruction.

If the problem of providing employment for a portion even of the vast multitude which now seeks it, too often in vain, is to be satisfactorily solved, the duty of sacrificing personal taste and prejudice to proved necessity cannot be too peremptorily enforced. In many quarters it is already recognised. Amongst the eligible occupations for younger sons of great noblemen are now recognised not only commissions in the army and navy, Government appointments, stipendiary magis-

tracies and the like, but positions in mercantile and trading houses, sheep farming, ordinary farming, plantations in the colonies, India, and America. When dukes are willing to apprentice the cadets of their houses to merchants and to stock-brokers, an example has been set which it is well should be extensively followed. The crowds of young men who now sigh for gentlemanlike employment, and despair querulously because it is not forthcoming, will have to reconcile themselves to a perceptible descent in the social scale. The gospel of levelling up has been proclaimed up to the point at which a reaction against its precepts is unavoidable. It has done good in its way, and has disseminated broadcast the leaven of a healthy and stimulating ambition. Before long we are destined to witness a new social movement. It will be felt that the practical knowledge of some specific trade is a better preventive against want, poverty, and failure, than a vague knowledge of clerkly requirements and a general adaptability for clerkly duties. Lads who now seek to live at the desk may succeed in securing for themselves the means of living at the bench and in the engine-room; and signs are now visible that in a few years hence no social stigma will be considered to rest upon those who have boldly accepted the change. Yet even then it is not possible to forecast the future without some apprehensions. The depression in trade is naturally making its influence felt with sinister force in the domains of industry. Parents who would have been, in normal seasons, only too

grateful for such a chance, hesitate to send their sons into the offices of Manchester or Liverpool merchants because the conditions of business are bad, and the prospects of future success are not encouraging.

In the case of the medical profession, there may be seen evidence of the same desire to guarantee the efficiency of those entering it, as at the Bar and in other callings. But the number of those doctors who make really large incomes is comparatively small. We hear of the successes, but we do not hear of the failures; and not merely in the provinces, but in London there are a great number of practitioners who can scarcely contrive to support themselves and families. The life of the country doctor is exceedingly trying to the system even of a strong man; he is liable to be up at all hours of the night, performs long journeys in the most inclement weather, receives poor fees, and these not always paid with regularity or certainty. The general practitioner, whether in London or elsewhere, is the lineal successor of the apothecary, who in former days was resorted to in the case of minor ailments, and who prescribed and sent out medicines. This practitioner can sue for his fees in a court of law. On the other hand, the fellows and members of the Royal College of Physicians are prohibited by the bye-laws of the college, confirmed by recent Act of Parliament, from recovering fees by legal process. They are thus placed upon the same footing as barristers, who must receive their honorarium when the professional service is rendered, or run the risk

of losing it altogether. This is the most important distinction between the general practitioner, who very often is a Doctor of Medicine of a Scotch or Irish university, and the pure physician or F.R.C.P. The last honour is reserved for those who, after having shown themselves conspicuous in the science or practice of medicine as members of the College of Physicians, are after four years membership nominated by the council, and subsequently balloted for by the fellows of the college generally. The average medical man in London can make an income of £1,000 to £2,000 a year; the more distinguished, from £5,000 to £12,000. Incomes above this are very rare, for the simple reason that there is literally not the time in which to do the extra work. As in Germany, so in England, the fees charged for surgical operation are small in comparison with those current in America and Paris. Of the generous and disinterested attention of many doctors to their patients at large the public knows something, but is, perhaps, less acquainted with their devotion to science. A curious instance of this may be mentioned which occurred not long ago in London. There arrived one day in the English capital from France a medical man who had been dedicating his energies exclusively to the study of physiology. Suddenly he attracted notice, and was astonished to find patients flocking to consult him on nerve diseases; very shortly he was in possession of a practice of more than £5,000 a year. He told his professional friends



he should completely surrender it as soon as he could secure an annuity of £300 a year. It was not believed that he would persevere in his resolve; he did persevere, however, and when he had realised his modest ambition went to America to pursue his old studies, and devoted himself to science.

One of the most important and remarkable advances in modern surgical practice is the revolution that has been effected by the introduction of the antiseptic method of treating wounds. In the medical profession, as in others, there is always a strong conservative vein, and there are many surgeons who insist that this process has not been the exclusive cause of the results attributed to it. But the fact that the antiseptic method gains ground daily in all countries, being generally adopted in England, universally in Scotland, almost universally in Germany, to a large extent in America, and gradually in France, is a sufficient testimony to its intrinsic merits. Nor is it only danger to the patient which is diminished by this method. The doctor himself is secured against many perils to which he was previously exposed. The perils under which the medical man pursues his tasks are infinitely greater than are generally imagined. Many young doctors are stricken down on the threshold of life in the fever-wards of hospitals. The late Dr. Charles Murchison was repeatedly at death's door before he could pursue his fever studies without imminent risk of being infected by the disease. He lost two children from the

effects of a malady which he had twice brought home. A distinguished Scotch physician, Sir Robert Christison of Edinburgh, approaching, in 1879, his ninetieth year, suffers from recurrent attacks of fever, consequent on his exposure to morbid influences in the exercise of his professional duties. Whether under fire on the battle-field, assisting the wounded, or in the not less deadly arena of disease, statistics show with what fidelity the lives of medical men are spent in the service of mankind. According to the returns of the Registrar-General, the mortality of medical officers is nearly twenty per cent. higher than that of combatant officers of the same age.

Politics, diplomacy, and, to a certain extent, the army, are ornamental professions; not money-making, but money-spending careers. Successful politicians in England are seldom needy men. Neither Lord Beaconsfield nor Mr. Gladstone have risen from poverty or obscurity, or started in life absolutely devoid of the advantages enjoyed by the rivals and contemporaries whom they have defeated or distanced. The constituencies in 1874 elected as their representatives the richest assemblage in the world, and the House of Commons gave its confidence to a Cabinet of eminently rich men. Even in the two ministerial whips it had country gentlemen of large landed estate and big rental. The instances in this century of a member of the House of Commons rising to position and influence who did not belong to one of the two aristocracies—the aristocracy of birth

or wealth—or who did not contract an alliance with one of these so closely that he became identified with it, are rare exceptions. There are, certainly, members of the House of Commons who have no regular income of their own, no estate, no remunerative profession. But they make something out of directorships, and they occasionally pick up a windfall in the City. These have seldom any very lofty ambitions. They do not mistake themselves for heaven-born statesmen, and they are quite satisfied if they have enough to pay for their subscription to the best club in London, and the other necessities or luxuries of life. There is also in the House of Commons a large allowance of professional men who would be described as working for their daily bread. But what does this really mean? The professional men alluded to are either lawyers of large practice or persons engaged in commerce. In the former case they are for the most part in the position of being able to say adieu to their clients to-morrow without any fear of starvation; in the latter, their business manages itself—they have deputies and agents in whom they can thoroughly trust. If any supervision is needed it is of the least possible kind, and their share of work is confined to pocketing a due proportion of profits. Barristers go into the House for a definite reason. A parliamentary seat, if they can get it, is a distinct advertisement. Even then it is a costly mode of appeal to litigants and attorneys. A country gentleman with an estate of £5,000 a year, a family, and a town

house, who goes into the House of Commons determined to make politics a study, finds it not too easy to keep out of debt. A barrister whose fees do not amount to more than £3,000 per annum will probably find, if he only thinks about augmenting his business, that he is without any adequate return for his expenditure of time and money. A parliamentary career is and will remain open to talent; but only on condition that talent has the ballast of wealth. Hard as this may seem, in individual cases there is a sound reason for it, and it works well and fairly in the long run. When the late Duke of Marlborough—then Marquis of Blandford—brought forward his Reform Bill, as a sort of *ballon d'essai*, he proposed that members of Parliament should be paid, and the proposal was rightly characterised as democratic in its tendencies. So long as poverty continues to be a political disqualification, there will be generally insured integrity and independence. If the House of Commons was a place for making money rather than spending it, it would at once be degraded in the national opinion. Thus it is that though, of those who succeed in the House of Commons, some have more money and some less, the assistance of money has been indispensable, and has been forthcoming to almost all.

Passing from politics to diplomacy we come to what is virtually another unpaid profession. No sensible man would think of sending his son into it unless he was prepared to allow him at the very least four or five

hundred a year, an allowance not to be withdrawn or reduced when he was promoted to the position of third secretary with a salary of £150, but to continue throughout his career, and to be secured to him after his parents' death. Such a profession, though diplomatists may be the pets of society, can never be a really popular one. With certain qualifications the same remarks are true of the Foreign Office. The principle of competition does indeed to a limited extent exist at the Foreign Office—ten candidates being usually nominated to one vacancy. The severity of the examinations depends not so much on the number as on the acquirements of those who compete in it. Thus in the competition for the Indian Civil Service, it is an exception if there are more than ninety lads whose ability and knowledge are entitled to consideration. The vacancies are from thirty-five to forty; and it follows that the chances are less than three to one against each of those who are really in the running. Now in the Foreign Office competitions there are no men of straw. Not only has the patronage list by no means invariably been adhered to, but special invitations have been sent to certain famous heads of houses at Oxford and Cambridge to suggest promising candidates. Nor is it easy to see how this state of things is to be remedied. Make the examinations for the Diplomatic Service competitive, and it is certain that some at least of those personally and socially qualified in a high degree will be excluded. For instance, young men who have been educated in the

traditions and atmosphere of diplomacy from infancy, the sons, it may be, of ambassadors or *chargés d'affaires*, who have friendships and connections in every European capital, to whom it is a second nature socially to conciliate and correctly to interpret public feeling and political intention, would often be hopelessly defeated in a general competitive examination. Again, supposing the Foreign Office were to open its doors to all comers, means might, conceivably, be taken to withdraw with one hand what was given with the other. If the Foreign Office were to place itself under the new regulations known as Scheme I., the open competition for it would take place at the same time and place, and in the same subjects as that for other high-class offices. But it would be perfectly practicable for the authorities of the Foreign Office to make their selection, not from any of the new-comers and successful candidates, but from young men already in the Civil Service of pleasing manners, good connections, and independent means. In a word, open competition at the Foreign Office might come to signify in practice the adoption of that mode of nomination by transfer which has created dissatisfaction at the Treasury.

There remains the army. That the profession of arms is, during the last quarter of a century in England, extremely popular with all classes, high and low, cannot be doubted any more than that the tone and qualifications of officers of all branches of the service have signally improved. The army, at

the present day, is at once aristocratic and national; it enjoys the favour of society, and the sons of the people gain Her Majesty's commission, and serve with credit and success. On the one hand, the complaint is made, with whatever degree of truth, by university authorities, that young men of birth and position do not go to Oxford and Cambridge in the same numbers as formerly; on the other hand, since the abolition of purchase, there have been certainly signs of the growth of a class which was formerly strange among us, namely, that of the professional soldier. Thus if there are more young men who adopt the army as a kind of social training-school, and a substitute for academic life, there are more also who enter it with a determination, like that which has been already noted among barristers, to make out of it the business of their lives. Nor is there anything to warrant the belief that the officers of the English army are likely to be less efficient soldiers in the future than in the past. The competition for commissions in the line is tolerably keen, but the examination is simple. There is not the slightest appearance of any deterioration in the physique or muscular accomplishments of candidates since competition has been established. On the contrary, they are generally spoken of as being smarter than ever, knowing better what their duties are, and better able to perform them. If they are better scholars they are also better soldiers.

So far as the aristocracy is concerned it is intelligible

that fewer of their sons should go annually to the university. The taste for culture among the upper classes of English society is not on the increase. In the old days the bench of bishops was largely reinforced from the sons of the great families. This natural process of ascent from the purple to the prelacy has ceased to be the order of the day. The Church of England is looked upon as an institution that holds its existence upon a precarious tenure. There is nothing to prevent young men in any rank of life from going to the university first, and into the army afterwards. A certain number of commissions are annually given to selected candidates from Oxford and Cambridge. These nominations, however, are not to the army direct, but only to Sandhurst; and the young officer who prefaces a military career with an academic training considers that he loses three or four years in the competition for a colonelcy.

The army, like emigration, or indeed like many departments of commercial life, is practically closed against lads who have not the command of a certain amount of capital. In England the subaltern in a marching regiment cannot possibly live on his pay; in India he may not only be independent of the support of his friends, but may lay by money. When not on foreign service, the pay of the sub-lieutenant is £100 7s. 6d. per annum, of the lieutenant £118 12s. 6d. or £136 17s. 6d., according to the length of his service; and of captain £211 7s. 11d.; from which must be deducted twenty days'



pay for band and mess—for though the former claim is not now compulsory, it is generally admitted. To this must be added the cost of entertainments of one kind and another; and whilst a French subaltern, having no mess to pay, probably gets his meals at a restaurant for £3 or £4 a month, an English officer of the same grade will find his necessary expenses nearly four times that sum.

No account of the existing opportunities of professional England would be complete without some brief survey of the career of letters. Yet though literature must be regarded not merely as an art, but as a profession, or a trade, and while there are a greater number of persons in England now making a comfortable living by their pen than was ever previously known, there is less of what can properly be called a distinctly professional literary class. Most moderately well-educated people nowadays are actual or potential authors. They have dabbled in literature for purposes of pleasure or profit, they have published a book, or they have written magazine or newspaper articles. It is the enormous development of periodical literature of one sort or another which is the great feature of the times. The contributors to these publications are drawn from every class of English society, and there are comparatively few persons realising anything like a comfortable income from their pen who are independent of the periodical press in some shape or other. A poet may achieve a considerable reputation, and yet make nothing

by his writings; a novelist may be steadily patronised by the circulating libraries, and yet secure only the most moderate pecuniary returns. Even an historian or a philosopher may have impressed the stamp of his intellect upon the age, and yet be unable to live on what his work brings in. Only those who have risen to the highest position in the various departments of independent authorship, as philosophers, historians, novelists, or poets, can command large prices. Undisputed eminence may realise a handsome fortune; respectable mediocrity can barely keep the wolf from the door.

Without the assistance of journalism, no writer not of established reputation can make what even to a modest ambition would seem a comfortable fortune; but journalism is a calling in which a fair measure of success may be insured by most who are not egregiously unfitted for the career. Yet even journalism, however handsome the incomes made by the successful in it may appear, cannot be pronounced otherwise than poorly remunerated, if compared with certain other professions, such as the law or medicine. There are very few cases known or possible, in which a newspaper writer, not being the editor of a journal, can hope to realise more than £1,500, or at the most £2,000 a year; probably not half the sum that either a barrister or doctor, occupying an analogous level of professional distinction, earns. And though it may be said that the journalist who secures this position is not doomed to wait like the one for

briefs, or like the other for patients, for an indefinite period, it must be remembered that the necessary expenses of his life are not inconsiderable. He has, indeed, no great establishment to keep up; but he probably finds it necessary to live in a convenient, which is usually a costly quarter of the town, and in such matters as locomotion his disbursements are often exceptionally heavy. The hours, too, and the conditions under which his work has to be done, are not such as to suit all persons. If he writes leading articles, he will have to hold himself at the disposition of his editor, and will very often have to turn night into day. In this matter different arrangements are made in different newspaper offices: in some, no regular engagement is given to the writer of the leading articles unless he comes to the office between ten and eleven every night; in all, the development of telegraphic communication renders it necessary for the professional journalist to hold himself in readiness to write at a moment's notice, and at any hour.

Most daily newspapers are now supplied with special wires: in the case of the metropolitan press, between London and some one or more of the Continental capitals; in the case of the provincial press, between the town of issue and the capital. Newspaper activity and enterprise, as in London so in the provinces, have been exhibited on a very surprising scale. In most great towns in England there are journals published every morning, equal in most respects to those which

appear in London. There is variety of news, that news is well arranged, and the comments on it have often the merit of comparative brevity. The views taken by the writers are, moreover, sometimes more independent of official and parliamentary influence. In his "Order and Progress," Mr. Frederic Harrison says: "The enormous preponderance in the State with which the House of Commons has gradually invested itself has overshadowed journalism, and has converted journalism into something which is called a fourth estate, but is really an appendage to the Commons." At the same time, it is beginning to be recognised as a fact that mechanical adherence to a political party does not increase the power of a newspaper, and that genuinely independent journalism is one of the great products of the time.

There is more of originality, freshness, ability, vigour, and variety displayed in the newspaper press of England than in that of any other country in the world. It is customary to contrast the position of journalism in England with its position in France, not a little to the advantage of the latter, and there may be some truth in the conclusion. That it is much easier to gain a political position by writing for the French press than by writing for the English, is chiefly due to the circumstance that in France newspaper articles are signed, and in England they are not. But the signed system is really impossible in England, and may some day become impossible in France. For every newspaper in England, there are, probably, four in France—

exclusive organs of the countless cliques held together by the personal influence of a few individuals, of which the French political system is composed. Thus the French newspapers are sectarian rather than national. Neither in Paris nor in the provinces is any such phenomenon to be observed as a great journal which speaks to the people as a whole. While parties are as infinitely divided and subdivided as is the case in France, a journal which would really be a symbol of national unity is impossible. Thus we have a host of petty prints, insignificant in their influence and in their contents, consisting of short occasional notes, novels, a brief narrative of contemporary events, and articles penned by the acknowledged literary leader of a political coterie. English journalism represents interests; French journalism represents opinions.

That which has been chiefly instrumental in making journalism a not unprofitable profession for so many hundreds and thousands of Englishmen is the development, the energy, and the enterprise of the penny press. Few people have any adequate idea of the magnitude of the interests which this press represents. Let us take the case of one of the leading penny papers of the metropolis. Here is a journal whose average total expenditure is from £260,000 to £270,000 a year, and whose annual profit is from £55,000 to £60,000. If these figures are respectively divided by 313—the number of working days in a year—we shall have the daily expenditure and profit of a London

paper, sold for the twelfth part of a shilling. It will thus be found that the expenses *per diem* of such a paper amount, roughly speaking, to £860, and that the daily profit is close upon £200—in other words, the total daily receipts are as nearly as possible £1,000, and the total yearly receipts £313,000. This, of course, includes every item on which, in a daily newspaper office, it may be necessary to expend money—printing machinery, telegraphic wires, telegrams, and the pay of editors, sub-editors, writers, reporters, and others. These establishments do not only exist in London, but in most large towns of the country; and though the scale on which they are carried on in the provinces is less considerable than in London, the number of persons for whom employment is afforded is very large. The writing of leading articles is only one branch of the profession of journalism. Within the office of a daily newspaper is a staff of managers, clerks, cashiers, in addition to those persons concerned in the actual production of it. Outside, there is a regiment of reporters, some in the Houses of Parliament, some in the law courts, perpetually busy, and earning for the most part sufficient to support themselves and their families. In near and remote quarters of the world are special correspondents—themselves representing a numerous and important branch and interest of journalism—transmitting graphic word-pictures by telegraph or mail of battles, sieges, celebrations, jubilees: now of a wedding, and now of a funeral; to-day of a death in Central Africa, to-morrow

of a sudden disaster that has fallen upon an entire neighbourhood in Central Europe. Peculiar qualifications are indispensable in the case of the special correspondent. He must not merely have the pen of a ready, a vigorous, and an effective writer, but must possess a robust constitution capable of bearing extremes of climate and temperature; must be able to write under any circumstances, and to contrive by some means or other to post himself wherever anything of importance is taking place; and, moreover, be as impervious to moral or social rebuff as to physical fatigue.

Notwithstanding the development of new types of journalism: of weekly newspapers embellished with every kind of illustration (some of them employing special artists as the daily journal employs its special correspondents), devoted to every kind of topic or interest—literature, art, the stage, science, trade (for nowadays most trades have their special representatives in the weekly press), amusement, sport, “society”—notwithstanding these novel additions to the long list of the newspaper press and their periodical multiplications (for one success is sure to provoke a host of imitators, not necessarily always failures—it may possibly be that in England the newspaper of the future has yet to come into being. There are some persons who think that under the present system we are over-ridden with leading articles, and that a journal which should revert to its original function of supplying in the first instance news, and of commenting upon this news in the briefest and

pithiest way, would command a large success. It does not follow that if this prospect were fulfilled the influence of the English newspaper press would be materially lessened. As it is, the press has, probably, more power in the discussion of social than of political questions; but in either its power does not arise exclusively from its comments. The business of newspapers is not so much to create or withstand popular cries, as to help to regulate them, and to supply the public with materials for estimating their value. Foreign correspondents, reporters of every kind, have almost as much opportunity of instructing the public mind by the news they give, and the way in which they give it, as leader-writers themselves. If there be any defect in English journalism at the present time, it is that it gives us too much of opinion, and too little of news; and that in giving us news, it does not always exercise sufficient discrimination as to what does and what does not come within this category. There is not likely to be any change in the methods by which alone success in newspaper proprietorship is possible. While we may anticipate that newspapers will give us more and more intelligence and less and less criticism, and while it may be reasonable to anticipate for them an immensely increased circulation, the cost of production will still be so enormous that the proprietors can only hope substantially to recoup themselves by advertisements. It is, and it will probably continue to be, the literal fact that the multiplication of the copies



sold is only useful as an agency for increasing the number of advertisements; and that except when paper is unusually cheap, the actual profit realised on each impression sold is infinitesimal.

There is a large and important section of professional England which lies far outside the four seas. Official England and commercial England exist in the foreign dependencies of Great Britain as well as in Great Britain herself, and the fortunes spent in the mother country have often been made in the tropics or at the antipodes. Firmly wedded though England has been to a policy of non-intervention in European affairs, she has never remained long without an opportunity of showing in different parts of her colonial empire that there still breathes within her the spirit that has made her the mistress of a continent. Her colonial empire has not only supplied Englishmen with an opening for their industry and peaceful enterprise, but has also exercised them in the profession of arms. Not merely in the eighteenth century, but in the nineteenth century too, have India and our colonies provided much the same stimulus for English imagination and for English enterprise, as did the wars of Raleigh and Blake against the Spanish in the Elizabethan epoch. India, however, while it has been undoubtedly the nurse of the military sentiment amongst Englishmen, has been much besides. It has not only provided a military career for hundreds and thousands of Englishmen, but it has brought with it a great amount of purely civilian occupation—that of

the engineer, the merchant, the tea planter, as well as of the civil administrator. The competition wallah is now rather more than a quarter of a century old, and under the system, the government of India has been placed in the hands of the great multitude of the English middle classes—with many advantages to the latter, and not a few to India itself. Competition has unquestionably raised the average official standard. Work in all its branches, and more especially in the lower, is better done than formerly. The past generation of Anglo-Indian civilians would, it may be assumed, have been infinitely less successful than the present, in making abstracts of evidence, in drawing up decisions, and in writing reports. And while some scholars, and several more or less distinguished *litterateurs*, have been the result of the competition wallahs, the class has not proved deficient in men of action, or men of great business-like aptitudes. There is thus a distinct improvement in the general administration of the affairs of the empire, in the administration of justice, in the arrangement of municipal matters; there is also less of malingering, of idleness, of jobbery, and of favouritism.

These great virtues are not without their corresponding defects. No administrator of the highest distinction has yet appeared amongst the new Indian civilians; nor can it be said that, as a body, these have displayed the loyalty to the Government, which was characteristic of the period when the distribution of official honours was mainly a matter of family arrangement. There were in

those days innumerable abuses; but above and redeeming all, there was an idea that the general interests of the Government were the interests of each individual serving under it. If extra duties had at any time to be discharged, they were discharged without grumbling, because the officials felt that all exertion promoted the welfare of the firm. The competition "wallahs," on the contrary, are not in every case alive to the same kind of corporate interest. They have gone to India to make as much money out of the country as possible, and to leave it as quickly; to realise an early annuity and return home. They are in the position of men who have contracted with their employers to do a certain amount of work and no more, and who, if any exceptionally heavy demand be made upon them, resent it as an imposition. The feeling is, that the Government has fixed its terms and must be kept to them.

Nor can the more general relations between England and India be looked on as entirely satisfactory under the new system. There is less of sympathy and acquaintance with the natives than formerly. The wallahs are better linguists than their predecessors, but they see very little of the native gentlemen of the country. This, of course, may be in a great degree due to the relations which have been developed between natives and Europeans as a consequence of the Mutiny; and it may be readily admitted that sometimes the old civilians were too friendly with the natives—borrowing their horses and carriages, and making them buy often

useless articles when leaving the country on furlough or for good. Still, it cannot be desirable that the natives should say, as they are apt now to say, "We cannot have a chat with your officers, or ask advice." Again, whereas in the old times possibly half the officials were relatives or friends of the directors, and were in constant personal communication with the representatives of the Home Government, there is to-day little or no connection or common interest between the wallahs and the department of the Secretary of State in Whitehall.

## CHAPTER XXXI.

### IMPERIAL ENGLAND AND CONCLUSION.

**Increasing Need of Emigration—Extent and Character of the British Empire—Past and probable Future Increase of our Colonial Population—Relations of Colonies to Mother Country: (1) Financial, (2) Commercial—Loyalty of Colonies to Mother Country—Imperial Federation—Forces of Repulsion and Cohesion at Work in the Relations between England and her Colonial Dependencies—Common Features of the Colonies—Points on which the Condition of the Colonies may be considered prophetic of the Condition of Things yet to be realised in England—General Nature of England's Responsibilities—Imperial Duties of the Statesmanship of the Future—What will that Future be?—Conclusion.**

WE have seen that among the chief wants of domestic England is that of careers and professions for her sons. The estimated total population of the United Kingdom was in 1876 close upon thirty-four millions. It is increasing at something like two millions every ten years, and the rate will yet be accelerated. By the close of the century the inhabitants of these islands can scarcely number less than forty-five million souls. How within the four seas are employment and the means of subsistence to be found for so vast a multitude? Here, then, the opportunities of colonisation suggest themselves; and it is natural to turn from the smaller Britain, which is at home, to the greater Britain, which is beyond the seas.

Nearly a quarter of a million of Queen Victoria's subjects left the shores of their country in 1877 for

## IMPERIAL ENGLAND AND CONCLUSION.

foreign lands, including the United States of America. A larger number could well have been spared. It is sometimes said that the chances which await the emigrant in the colonies are not better than the chances he leaves behind him in the country of his birth. This is partly because many of those who yearly set sail for our foreign dependencies are men who have failed in England, and partly because the conditions of colonial life and the qualifications requisite for colonial success are imperfectly understood. Two things seem certain: one, that the intending colonist who has not capital must be prepared to perform any work, however irksome or lowly, which is forthcoming; the second, that emigration should take place at a much earlier age than is now usual. A national system of education is giving us annually, and in an increasing degree, a number of fairly intelligent boys and girls, for all of whom there cannot be sufficiently remunerative occupation here. In these may be recognised the material for colonists, who would not only win prosperity and comfort for themselves, but who would be a great acquisition to the dependency to which they migrated. Emigration societies already exist in England. It might surely be possible to extend the operations of these in such a way as to draft off a certain annual percentage of the surplus population before they could learn the evil ways of idleness.

The precise extent and population of the foreign dominions of England cannot, perhaps, be estimated with absolute certainty. The Colonial Office in London

has to deal with several different kinds of communities. There are the military outposts, such as Gibraltar and Malta; next there are those—like the West India Islands, Ceylon, Natal, the Transvaal, the Mauritius, and others—which are known as Crown colonies, where also the executive is still with the Crown; thirdly, there are the self-governing colonies—the Australian group, the Canadian domain, New Zealand, and Cape Colony. Another principle of division might be adopted—that of colonies which are and colonies which are not adapted for permanent inhabitation by Europeans. Excluding all that come under the latter category, and amongst them the British Empire in India, there remains a total area of four millions of square miles, eminently suited, so far as climate is concerned, to be the abiding home of men and women of the British race. If there be added to this the dependencies that have been purposely omitted, those of British India and the other tropical settlements, another four millions of square miles will have to be taken into consideration. In other words, of the entire surface of the globe, eight millions of square miles, or rather more than one-eighth, is British territory, whilst of the true home of all white races—the temperate regions of the earth—eighty per cent. belongs to Great Britain and the United States of America, of which the former possesses forty-four per cent., or nearly one-half of the whole. Physical conditions render it necessary for the European emigrant seeking a home for himself and his children to go where the English language is spoken and where English institutions pre-

## *IMPERIAL ENGLAND AND CONCLUSION.*

vail. If he studies the character of the men and women around him, he will find that it can only be understood by a knowledge of English history—that it has, in fact, been formed by the character of Englishmen in past ages; and if he should go to Africa, or to the great islands of the West, or to America north of the St. Lawrence, he will yet find himself a subject of the English Queen. The population of these colonies has increased in the last twenty-one years eighty-eight per cent., at which rate they should have at the end of the century a population of fifteen millions.

It will be well, next, to inquire what are the financial relations of the mother country to the colonies. So long as the colonies were treated as places of exile for criminals, it was right that England should contribute not only to their military defence but to their civil government. As a matter of fact, the expenditure which the colonies now entail upon the mother country is less than two millions a year. It is said that her colonial empire imposes upon Great Britain a further cost in the necessity of maintaining a much larger fleet than she would otherwise require. But the obvious answer to this is, that under any circumstances a fleet scarcely smaller than that which is now supported would be necessary for the protection of British commerce. In order to reduce the fleet, the commerce of the country as well as its colonies must be sacrificed; a result for which those who are willing to part with the colonies are not prepared. Besides, an essential gain to England from her colonies is found in the



commercial relations which exist between the two. The expression, "Trade follows the flag," is simply a way of saying that the lines of commerce coincide with the limits of empire. In proportion as British commerce with the United States decreases, and the United States supplant England in her own domestic markets, the greater the necessity to cement the commercial union between Great Britain and her colonies. Notwithstanding the protectionist legislation which exists in many colonies, they still take more English goods than any other country or people. Whilst in 1874, our nearest neighbours bought less than 17s. a head of British commodities, our fellow-countrymen at the antipodes purchased an average of £10 worth. Our imports from and our exports to the colonies are respectively about 11 per cent. and  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of the imports and exports from and to all other countries.

Even thus, it may be said, the relations between the colonies and the mother country are not satisfactory, and until an imperial tariff has been established, by which an approach to free trade is ensured throughout the whole of the British Empire, the colonies have the power to place the mother country under a positive disadvantage. The prospects of the ultimate accomplishment of such a measure depend upon the general political relations which events may develop between the mother country and the colonies. That the last few years have witnessed the assertion of the imperial sentiment in England, not as a mere effervescence, but as an

abiding phase of national conviction, there may, or may not, be reason to believe. When, in 1878, there seemed a prospect of a hostile collision between Russia and England, the offer was made repeatedly by the colonial subjects of the English Crown in Canada and at the antipodes to despatch battalions of volunteers. This is a circumstance which, with many others, is suggestive of the conviction that the great colonies of England have no wish to sever the link that binds them to the mother country, even though the connection imposes on them the perils and burden of responsibility. It is the almost unanimous opinion of competent observers, who have by extensive travel made themselves acquainted with colonial feeling, that her dependencies would scorn to stand aloof from a war undertaken in defence of those principles which lie at the foundation of English greatness, or in redemption of those engagements which Great Britain has in time past undertaken. There is, of course, another side to this question. It may be urged that the colonies will not permanently consent to be liable for the results of a policy which they have had no part in shaping; and certainly if this policy were to be systematically turbulent, aggressive, and costly, that is a reluctance which would be very emphatically displayed. The practical question thus arises, How will it be possible to give the colonies the influence they may claim in moulding imperial policy?

For the direct dependence of the colonies on the mother country, it is suggested that there may be gradually substituted a federation of all English-

speaking countries: each self-governing as to the management of its local affairs; each bound to assist the other in time of imperial emergency; and each represented at some given imperial centre, which might be, as now, London. But in addition to the practical difficulties in the way of this proposal, and the confusion in the working of the representative principle that it would involve, there is the fact that at the present moment the colonies are directly or indirectly represented in the House of Commons by men who have passed their lives there. This does not dispose of the circumstance that there is much in the position of the colonies which may lead to future conflict. Though the self-governed dependencies make their own laws, the Crown has a veto which is exercised through the Colonial Minister of the day. There are other difficulties that the existing relations may develop. It has been said, though, as a matter of fact, experience is seldom likely to prove such to be the case, that the English system of party government, and the chance which there always exists of the colonial policy of one Government being reversed by that of its successor, may keep the colonists in a state of unrest that will become intolerable. There is the further consideration that the political party which, for the time being, is the depository of power in England, may be opposed to that which is in the ascendant in the colonies, and that thus want of political sympathies may pave the way to the disintegration of the empire.

But if these are the apparent agencies of repulsion,

what are the forces of cohesion actually at work? No more powerful influence has exerted itself in the latter half of this century than that of nationality. Italy has become united, the German Empire established, whilst the American Union has been cemented by a war which cost half a million of men and a thousand millions of money. The same influence can scarcely fail to make itself felt among the English-speaking races throughout the world. These have not only a common language, but a common history. The union may necessitate, as for the matter of that all political union does, much of mutual concession and compromise. There is also an attraction for the multitude in these dependencies in their association with so ancient a sovereignty as that of England. But if the connection between the mother country and the colonies is to be sentimental mainly, it is clear that the mother country herself must omit nothing that can promote and strengthen this sentiment in an appropriate way. The colonists must not be treated like poor relations. Hence Mr. J. A. Froude suggests that, in addition to the single colonial decoration—that of St. Michael and St. George—which now exists, distinguished colonists should occasionally be elevated to the peerage, or should be made members of the Privy Council;\* that a certain number of vacancies in the various departments of the Civil Service at home and

\* While these pages are passing through the press the *Court Circular* of Aug. 15 contains the following announcement:—"Sir John Macdonald, K C.B., Prime Minister of Canada, was introduced at the Council and sworn in a member of the Privy Council."

abroad should be allotted to colonists; that Oxford and Cambridge should be encouraged to unite with the colonies in founding scholarships and fellowships bearing colonial names, the candidates for which should be educated in colonial schools; and finally, that there should be instituted in the British army and navy special opportunities for the display of colonial patriotism—that there should be Australian and Canadian regiments just as there are now Highland and Irish regiments.

Considerations affecting the nature of the tie which may in the future bind them together are not the only ones suggested by the present relations of the colonies to the mother country; and in the extent and condition of the foreign dependencies of Great Britain, other lessons than those of the greatness of England may be found. As the opinion of foreign nations is said to enable one to anticipate the verdict of posterity, so is it possible that in the state of the English colonies to-day the tendencies at work within the limits of the United Kingdom, and the direction in which British polity is drifting, may be recognised more clearly than if the attention were exclusively confined to England. Such conditions as life in a new country presents—the building up of new institutions, the release from old prejudices, the possession of larger individual power, the absence of pauperism, the avenues opened to personal ambition, the enjoyment of greater plenty, though associated with more adventurous life—must tell on the character of a people. On the other

hand, the circumstances of dealing with native races, the admixture of a foreign stock (such as the French in Canada, the Dutch in South Africa), the mode in which society has constructed itself (for example, the existence in some possessions of a convict element, the hasty attraction of population by gold or diamond mines, or its leisurely consolidation under less alluring temptations), and a great variety of other circumstances, emphasise local peculiarities in the separate communities. Thus the several white populations of the colonies and dependencies of the empire are growing up with many common and many widely divergent characteristics.

The common features are for the most part of an elevating nature. Of these the consciousness of taking part in the formation of a new community, the sense of individual power, the open-air life, the vast areas open to occupation, and the enjoyment of plenty may be named, whilst above all are the prospects of advancement to wealth and influence. Indeed, the last presents a *primâ facie* reason for anticipating in a colonial community an improvement of the stock whence it sprung. The colonists represent the people who have had the energy and courage to try to amend their position—they are, in other words, what a Darwinian would describe as the survival of the fittest. Thus whilst the people of exterior Great Britain are building up for themselves an important position in relation to their fellow-countrymen at home, there may be discerned amongst them the nascent

qualities of independence, self-reliance, ambition, generosity, and loyalty, somewhat tempered by conceit and by intolerance of the weaknesses of others.

An ordinary Englishman arrives in a colony with an idea that his colonial fellow-subjects have much to learn, and that he will instruct them. But the first few weeks in his new home are a succession of disillusionments. Colonists have their own ways of doing things, and they believe in those ways. After a time the would-be teacher also grows to believe in them. In the course of years he returns to the mother country. He comes back with something of the same contempt for the people at home as he originally carried out with him for the colonists. He expects to find things very much as he left them. Of course he is again undeceived. There has been no lack of progress, and, as he discovers, there is no want of capacity. Yet he is not unable, in spite of his protracted absence from the old country, to hold his own with his countrymen, while on the whole he finds that his own capacity has been improved by his colonial experiences. The successes of returned colonists are neither few nor inconsiderable.

To understand colonial institutions it is necessary to understand the colonists; for the virtues and faults of the latter are reflected in the former. Although these communities are small and young, they have intricate, complicated, and imperfectly developed organisms, some of which may be glanced at with a considerable amount of profit. The constitutional colonies are new departures, the parent state occupying a midway

position between them and the Crown dependencies. The last are the most antiquated; they strangely contrast not only with their mother but with their younger sisters. Democracy has a certain force in Great Britain, a larger force in the constitutional colonies, and little or no force in the Crown dependencies. And whilst colonial institutions do not appear to be approximating in character to those of the mother country, it is far from certain that those of the mother country are not tending in the direction of the young colonies.

The same causes lead to the production of like effects. The democratic influences at work in Great Britain are calculated to effect results, such as more powerful waves of democracy have accomplished in her foreign dependencies. It is rather hastily assumed that the difficulty, which is characteristic of colonial politics, of maintaining exclusively two strongly marked parties and preventing them from splitting up into many sections, is a consequence of want of age and tradition. Whoever analyses what is passing in the mother country may at least suspect that there is a tendency here also to destroy the distinctiveness of two political organisations, and to replace them with many schools of thought separated rather by present interests than by broad and fundamental differences. In the colonies, except during periods of peculiar political excitement, it is regarded as somewhat humiliating if a candidate should do more than promise support to a leader so long as he approves of his conduct. To undertake to support him



because he leads the party, and to express willingness to sink individual views to maintain party interests, would not be the way for a politician in that part of the world to recommend himself to his constituents. A colonial statesman is more blunt than diplomatic. True, he has to face many combinations, and he is constantly called upon to reconcile them by the exercise of more or less tact. But indefinite promises and vague postponements will not meet the difficulties with which he has to contend; he must show his hand, and say what he means. And as those with whom he deals are not more reticent, political utterances have a robustness which at times degenerates into a licensed freedom of language, apt to surprise public men who make it a rule carefully to weigh their words. With this freedom are associated a certain force and fluency from which it may be predicted that colonial politicians will develop into vigorous, capable statesmen, self-reliant, if somewhat wanting in refinement.

The government of a colony is very near to the people. Deputations are a recognised and frequent means of enforcing the popular will. These will not confide their grievances to subordinate servants of the government. In the same way, parliamentary representatives have to submit to the teachings of their constituents, who in turn are disposed to be faithful to their choice. If a member is reasonably assiduous, and does not fall a victim to some burning local question concerning which he has shown himself half-hearted, he may look

upon his seat as a tolerably safe possession for a series of years. Colonial constituencies generally approve salaried members. They take the plain view that they have no right to expect services without paying for them, and probably they are a little impressed with the idea that payment gives them the right of free criticism. In those colonies where payment of members does not yet prevail there is a strong inclination to adopt the system. The legislature is in almost every case composed of two houses, and the upper house is not as a rule the popular one. Rightly or wrongly, it is suspected that the members of this branch of the legislature favour the possession of large estates, and make it their business to protect the interests of the landowners. Still, with exceptions, the two houses pull well together. A great deal depends on the tact and ability of the governor, who is nominated by the Sovereign. An able governor keeps well in the background, and avoiding all suspicion of interference, quietly exercises a salutary influence. Greatly to the credit of the colonies, they attach the highest importance to education. Their public educational systems are of rare excellence, and they grudge no expense in maintaining them. The universal feeling is that no child should grow up uneducated, whilst, for the most part, a purely secular system is in favour. The colonies maintain at great expense charitable institutions, without, however, admitting any special legislation for paupers. They deal with pauperism as though its nature was accidental, and the result of exceptional misfortune. It is

no part of their belief that one section of the people has the right to look for constant support from another. In the absence of intricate vested interests, colonial legislation is more prompt and thorough than in the home country. At times there is a danger of the over-hasty enactment of new laws. Especial importance is attached to local government; many systems prevail, and the details are widely various. But every colony aims at perfecting its own system, accommodating it to its own peculiarities. Local government is designed on very broad foundations. Cities, towns, boroughs, road districts, hundreds, shires, and counties are variously included. The object is that the thinly and the thickly populated portions of the country should alike depend for local improvements on the exertions of the people most concerned, supplemented by such assistance as Parliament is willing to give from the general revenue. The excellence of their local institutions develops in the people a capacity for office that infinitely aids the larger object of colonial self-government. The local politician wins his way, by well-tryed service, to the most important positions in the central government. The ordinary institutions of government are closely modelled after those of the mother country. Sometimes the models are improved upon. The colonists do rapidly what they desire; the Queen's Government, equally wishful, has to defer until various interests can be sufficiently conciliated. The colonists are vigorous; if they think that legislation is required, they make short work of opposing forces,

effecting in a session as much as would take ten years' discussion in the English Parliament.

Society in the colonies is as largely divided as in older communities. There are sections and circles and cliques, each to itself a host. Patrician blood and old family associations are respected to a certain extent, but they do not lead society. Wealth, especially the wealth represented by landed possessions, gives to its owner, as a rule, the highest consideration, unless associated with want of education or want of character. To have risen by personal industry and perseverance is no bar to the attainment of the highest social position. Whatever tendency there may be to the formation of an aristocracy lies in the direction of a landed aristocracy. Professional men and merchants, however, are held in high esteem.

There is something allied to contempt felt for those who, possessing a certain amount of education and without a special occupation, are only fit for clerks or appointments in the Government service. Persons of this kind swarm in the colonies. They learn to envy the men who have to depend only on their physical strength. For in countries where labour is scarcely less valuable than capital, manual exertion commands, as might be expected, more respect than it does in crowded communities. That the labourer to-day should be his own master to-morrow, and a few years later a rich man, excites no surprise, for instances of the kind are plentiful. Politicians and public men do not necessarily hold high social positions. It can hardly

even be said that the pursuit of politics is a good road to social eminence. But exceptions must be made of the really successful public men who show marked ability and high character. Freedom and liberty inspire new ideas, and create a thirst for information. The press is held in great respect, and colonial journalism is distinguished by much ability. Art, the drama, and music are well encouraged. The best paid "stars" in the mother country find it profitable to make a colonial tour. Colonists, on the whole, are a pleasure-loving people. Manly sports are enthusiastically pursued. Cricket, football, rowing, boating, hunting, and horse-racing are as much venerated in the distant colonies as in the mother country; and occasionally colonial competitors show they are able to take their own part when set to compete with the champions of a population one hundredfold greater than their own. The colonists are law-abiding and law-loving people. Life and property are duly venerated. Occasionally there are exceptions in some inland village in which the convict taint has outlived the eradicating influences of education; but the rest of the community are unsparing in their enmity to lawlessness. Whenever excesses become marked, they are hunted down. The ringleaders are punished with extreme severity, whilst those who secretly sympathise with the guilty learn at least the discretion of expediency. It is seldom one hears now of the bushranging (as highway robbery is called) which was once not uncommon. There is a strong disposition to support

the independence of the law courts. Colonial judges are generally possessed of high attainments and great learning. The decisions of colonial courts are rarely upset on appeal to the Privy Council; the minor courts are well sustained. In some respects a longing eye may be cast to colonial example. In many colonies there are public prosecutors, whose duty it is to redeem criminal prosecutions from the suspicion of being used for the exercise of private vengeance, or the extortion of civil claims, as is too frequently the case when the criminal law is put into force by private individuals. The colonists, too, do not as a rule favour unpaid justices of the peace. Even in thinly populated districts they are disposed to employ capable stipendiary magistrates.

“For my part,” said Burke, in his speech on American taxation, “I look upon the imperial rights of Great Britain, and the privileges which the colonists ought to enjoy under those rights, to be just the most reconcilable things in the world. The Parliament of Great Britain is at the head of her extensive empire in two capacities: one as the local legislature of this island, providing for all things at home immediately, and by no other instrument than the executive power; the other, and I think her nobler capacity, is what I may call her imperial character, in which, as from the throne of heaven, she superintends all the several inferior legislatures, and guides and controls them all, without annihilating any.” There can be little doubt that it is upon the degree of fidelity with which the

mother country fulfils these duties towards her dependencies that her tenure of them rests. The empire of Great Britain is one which, having its beginnings in the fact of military superiority, finds the elements of its growth and strength in the idea of moral service to mankind, and in recognising, while performing this service, that it is no part of English duty to pose as a militant evangelist before the world, or to embrace every opportunity for a crusade of arms, wherever there may arise the semblance of a religious or imperial sanction. The problem which confronts England at the present time is to administer her empire on principles that are in consonance, not only with the national instincts of Englishmen, but with the changed political habits of the race. It is at least certain that no analogy can be drawn between the empire of England and any other empire that ever existed. All other empires have been based upon a despotism; the empire of England alone is based upon freedom and liberty.

It may be that the events of the next few years will decide the imperial future of this country. The relations that exist between Great Britain and her colonial dependencies may be strengthened or weakened, may be made closer or more distant, but can scarcely remain permanently what they now are. As it is at present constituted, the British Empire is in a state of potential disorganisation, and the chief link which binds its different parts together is the sentiment of patriotism that is common to all Englishmen. India,

with her feudatory princes and semi-independent governments, realises the idea of empire more than any other of the foreign possessions of the Crown, but the connection between England and India is unique. For the rest, the British Empire in its political and military aspects is as full of anomalies and contradictions as the British Constitution. The absence of immediate connection between the capital of the empire and the colony, or the personal views of a colonial governor, may plunge the mother country at any moment into a colonial war, for which it is unprepared, and of which the Home Government disapproves. The exigencies of British empire in Europe entail a war in Asia, and Parliament is unable definitely to fix the burden of payment on any one quarter. It is considered that British interests in Europe are jeopardised, and the question of introducing the foreign troops of the Crown to an island in the Mediterranean is canvassed in a debate that raises the deepest constitutional issues. A dead-lock ensues in the political life of an Australasian colony, and after months of negotiation with the Colonial Office in London nothing is settled. In commercial and financial affairs the same chaotic conditions exist. England is a nation of free traders. Yet as a man's worst enemies are those of his own household, so those most bitterly opposed to free trade are English subjects. The British Empire is held together by no imperial tariff, whilst the British dependencies impose protective duties on British exports, so heavy as sometimes to be almost prohibitive.



Such is the actual state of things, and such are the tendencies which this state of things discloses. Sooner or later it is inevitable that these tendencies should assert themselves in a definite shape. On the one hand, there is the strong, if sometimes latent, force represented by community of race, language, and for the most part of religion; on the other, there are divergencies and distractions in almost every department of the imperial system: which of these two sets of powers is ultimately to accomplish itself? It may be that events outside the limits of the British Empire are destined to be instrumental in answering this question. It is the age of big battalions and colossal armaments, and the arbiter of Europe is he who is the master of many legions. Moral force rests upon a basis of military power, and no diplomacy is successful unless it is prepared, in the last resort, to use the strong arm. Free trade and international exhibitions have not brought the millennium appreciably nearer to mankind. The military spirit was never stronger in England than to-day; the question, What must England do to retain her traditional place in the nations of the world? never more anxiously discussed. She may be warned against pursuing that imperial policy which would introduce India and the colonies as elements into her international relations in Europe, and which would teach her to use these dependencies as recruiting grounds for her imperial army. But if something of the sort be not done, England may at any moment find herself in the position of an island pitted against a continent. There is a

point beyond which reliance cannot be placed on the resources of the smaller England at home for men and arms; and may it not be necessary to go further than this, if Englishmen would show themselves able to hold their own against the great military empires of Europe? Organisation for such an end as this, and on an imperial scale, would mean a mode of imperial federation; and if the same spirit animates the English race in all parts of the world as has animated it in other ages, it is conceivable that England's place in the European system and the exigencies of the position, may force her to the choice between imperial federation and subsidence into a third-rate power.

There is much in the temper which has of recent years been displayed both in England and in her colonies to justify the belief that such an era as this may not be so very remote. The problem will certainly have to be discussed and settled. If no Royal Commission is heard of, specially appointed to investigate the existing relations between those various parts of the British Empire with which, on principles and by processes widely different, England has extended her area and influence, the hour must yet come when those relations will be considered and revised. The time and its necessities may be trusted to bring the statesmanship which they require. Events make the man, and it will be for the statesman of the future to assist in the development or destruction of the imperial idea. Some notion has been given of the extent and capacity of England's empire; what will England

do with it? Will the English democracy, whose sovereignty is becoming in the last resort paramount, decide that it is only a splendid encumbrance, or recognise that, without it, England herself would lose her historic character? Is that democracy about to show that, no more than others, it can boast immunity from the reproach of fickleness? or, proving itself possessed of the traditional constancy and firmness characteristic of the race, will it give assurance that though supreme power may have found a new depository, the manner in which that power is exercised will not be changed?

## INDEX.

---

### A

- Abolition of purchase: arguments for and against, ii. 247; inevitable hardships of, 248; its general results, 250, 251.
- Absenteeism: of the squire, i. 15; of the rector, 26—28; its evils in rural administration, 79.
- Accidents on railways, i. 441.
- Action, a necessity of social distinction, ii. 37.
- Actor, The, and acting. (*See The Stage.*)
- Administration of vast estates, i. 47—71; of smaller estates generally, 70, 71; advantages of the control of a superior agent, 71; administration of commercial business, 221—238. (*For Administration of Government offices, Trade, &c., see under different heads.*)
- Admiralty, The: constitution of the Board, ii. 238—240; its unique independence, 240; the Controller and his duties, 239.
- Adulteration of manufactured goods, its enormous harm, i. 219; its abandonment a national necessity, *ib.*
- Æstheticism. (*See Culture.*)
- Agent, The. (*See The Land Agent.*)
- Agricultural area of England, i. 327; how held, *ib.*
- Agricultural capabilities of Great Britain, Mr. Caird on, i. 326.
- Agricultural labourer: the suspicious nature of, i. 22, 23; the modern cottage, 295; the allotment, *ib.*; hours of labour, 296; diet, 296, 302. His career: as a boy, 297—299, his knowledge of nature, 298, bird-scaring abolished, 299, influence of the School Boards, 298; as a man—arduous duties of the shepherd, carter, milkman, 299, the day-labourer, 299—304, a day's work, 300—302, pay in harvest-time, 303, his recreations, 304. Squatters, poachers, and idlers, 305, 306; ill influence of the beerhouse, 306; his dress, 306, 307; advantages of the co-operative store, 307—309; effect of newspaper reading, 309, 310; reforms still necessary—overcrowding, sanitary evils, 311—316; influence of drink, a striking example, 320, 321; the statute fair, its evils, 322, happily dying out, *ib.*; women as field labourers, 323—325, Dr. Fraser's exceptions, 323, satisfactory examples from Northumberland, 323—325; hiring by families, curious instances, 323; agricultural wages, 331—334, special instances of, on a given day throughout England, 333, 334; value of milk diet in Northumberland 333 (*footnote*); improved condition of, 334, cheapness of necessities, 335, decrease of drunkenness, *ib.*; intelligence of the Northumberland peasant, 336; beneficial effect of the Poor Law of 1834, 337; the Agricultural Union, 338; his tolerance to the farmer, 339; prospects of the peasant and effects of education, 340; success of co-operation at Assington, 402.

**Agricultural unions :** objections to, i. 34; ill-advised questions asked by them through Mr. George Mitchell, *ib.*; their action and defects, 338.

**Agricultural wages.** (*See Wages.*)

**Aldermen :** their duties, i. 109; provincial aldermen, 119.

**Allotment, The,** i. 295; Dr. Fraser on, 318; a garden preferable, *ib.*

**Amsterdam,** once the international clearing-house, as London now is, i. 194.

**Amusements, Popular :** change of, in recent years, ii. 417; decrease of the showman, 419; influence of railway communication, 420, the excursion train, a scene on the Norfolk coast, 420—422; greater opportunities of recreation in the northern counties, 423; London recreations, 424, 425; the music-hall, its influences for good and evil, 425; higher amusements, the museum, the library, 426; the working man's club, its constitution and aims, 427, its aspect described, 427—430, expected beneficial result, 430; the drama, *ib.*, the theatre and its supporters, "old and new," 431—433, general features and aims of the modern stage, 433—439.

**Analysis, Triumph of, in the present age,** ii. 350.

**Arbitration :** beneficial result of, i. 284—287; special instances in the Cleveland district, 285; Mr. Mundella's early advocacy of, 284; the masons' strike of 1877, 286.

**Archdeacon, The, and his functions,** ii. 283—286.

**Architecture of the day,** ii. 375, 376.

**Archives, Variety and extent of, in a vast estate,** i. 67, 68.

**Area of England, Agricultural,** i. 327; how held, *ib.*

**Aristocracy, The :** "change" its habit, ii. 9, 10; a squire of the old school and of the new, 10—13; recent rush of, into commerce, 24, 25, 459; value of primogeniture, 25; our nobility are not "noblesse," 26, exclusiveness of the "noblesse" in Austria, Princess Esterhazy an instance, 26, 27, contrasted with English society, 28, 29; association of diverse ranks in English society, *ib.*, its necessary outcome, reserve, 28; precedence in England, with instances, 29—33; stimulated to action by the Reform Bill, 36; their avocations, 37, power in politics in past times and present influence, 49—52; influence of rank, 52; levelling up of the middle classes, 53; large share in present Ministry, 53, 54; decrease of number in the House of Commons, 143; elements of its perpetuation, 186; its influence and authority in the Parliament, 188, 189; its inclination to the Church of Rome, 303.

**Army, The :** exceptional social rank of the officer, ii. 47; numerous appeals to the War Minister, 122; army administration, the War Office, 241; difficulties presented, 242, 243; recent reforms, concentration, 244, its advantages, 245; supremacy of the Secretary for War, *ib.*; functions of the Commander-in-Chief, *ib.*; abolition of purchase, arguments for and against, 247, 248, necessary hardships, 248, absolute result, class as good, acquirements greater, 250, 251; introduction of short service, 251, 252, disadvantages of, 253; recruiting, its procedure and safeguards, 254, 255; education of the soldier, 255; effects of discipline, 256; advantages of the service, *ib.*; merits and defects of rank and file, 257; insufficiency of the forces for imperial duties, 258; the militia, its importance and growing estimation of, 258, 259; volunteers, their origin, 260,

- zeal, 261, and importance, 261, 262; the reserves, 261; the staff, *ib.*; military strength, 262; equipments, 263; its aspects as a profession, 467—470; the officer of to-day a professed soldier, and advantages, 468; pay and expenditure, 469, 470.
- Army and Navy Co-operative Society, The: its aspect and operations, i. 377—379; compared with the Rochdale store, 377, 382, 383; its progress, 395; its manufactories and benefits accruing therefrom, 396, 397.
- Arnold, Mr. Matthew: his theology, ii. 276; his influence on religious and æsthetic thought, 394; his writings, 396.
- Artisan, The: the policy of the member of Parliament towards defined, i. 126; predominance of working men in large towns, 143, 144; advanced propaganda, the Eleusis Club, 242; types of, 243; abundance of the better class, *ib.*; his virtues and vices, 244; his instinct conservatism, 245; his view of state emoluments, *ib.*; compared with the French and American workman, 246, his relation to the State contrasted with that of these, 246, 247; his moderation, 279; trades unions and their influence, 282—287; beneficial results of arbitration, 284—287; the masons' strike of 1877, 286; political bias of, 287, 288; as members of Parliament, 289; the London and provincial artisan contrasted, secularism of the former, 290, his habits and recreations, 290, 291, his difficulties in co-operation, 292, points of difference and causes thereof, 290, 291, the Sunday dinner, 293.
- Arts and Artists. (*See* Culture, Painting, and Music.)
- "Assington experiment, The:" success of, in agriculture, i. 402.
- Attorney, The: social status of, ii. 44.
- Austin, Mr. Alfred, as a poet, ii. 399, 400; "The Human Tragedy," *ib.*
- Author, The: exceptional social status of, and its reasons, ii. 42—47. (*See also* Literature.)

## B

- Bagehot, Mr. Walter: on the new and old constitution, ii. 76, 77; on the relations of Queen and Cabinet, and the Cabinet and people, 91, 92; on the vast prerogatives of the Queen, 94; his contrasts of republic and monarchy, 97.
- Bailiff, The. (*See* The Land Agent.)
- Bain, Mr. Alexander: his contributions to philosophy, ii. 342—345; his method, *ib.*; John Stuart Mill on his method, 343.
- Bank of England: its primary and exceptional functions, i. 192; its relation to other banks, 193.
- Banking-house, A: its aspect, i. 229; process of business in, 230; functions of the partners, 230, 231; the managing partner, 231; the financial partner, *ib.*; its organisation; heads of departments, 232, 233; a banking-house and a bank contrasted, 233; functions of the former, 234; estimate of capital employed, 235; necessity to watch the course of politics, 236, 237.
- Banks and Banking. (*See* Financial England and Banking-house.)
- Baptists, The. (*See* Nonconformity.)
- Bar, The: exceptional social rank of the barrister, and reasons for it, ii. 42—47; Queen's counsel, "silk" and "stuff," 208, 209; value of university "honours" at, 454; prospects and income of the profession, 455, 456.
- Barrister, The. (*See* The Bar.)

- Bath, its beauties, i. 175, 176.  
 Beaconsfield, Lord, his reception by the masses described, ii. 74, 75.  
 Bedford, Duke of: feudal customs at Woburn Abbey, i. 49.  
 Benefit Society, The village, i. 24, 25.  
 Betting, Evils of, in Sheffield, i. 142.  
 Bicycle, The: its advantage, i. 458; at Bushey Park, *ib*.  
 Biography and travel, ii. 409; Mr. Trevelyan's "Life of Macaulay," Mr. Sims' "Life of Lessing," *ib*.  
 Birmingham: primitive customs at, i. 166; contrasted with Manchester, 167; universality of its products, *ib*.; social re-organisation undertaken by its ladies, 168.  
 Bishop, The: his relation to the cathedral, ii. 287; his election, 288.  
 Black, Mr., as a novelist, ii. 408.  
 Black Country, The: abuses still extant in, i. 271, 272.  
 Blackmore, Mr., as a novelist, ii. 408.  
 Block system on railways, The: its working explained, i. 440.  
 Board of Guardians. (*See* Guardians.)  
 Board Schools. (*See* The School Board.)  
 Board of Trade, The, and its duties, ii. 110, 111.  
 Borough magistrates. (*See* Magistrates.)  
 Braddon, Miss, as a novelist, ii. 406.  
 Bradford. (*See* Yorkshire.)  
 Brick-yards: necessity for legislation in, i. 257; evidence of Mr. George Smith, *ib*.  
 Bright, Mr. John, as an orator, ii. 167.  
 Bristol, i. 173.  
 Broad Church, The. (*See* The Church of England.)  
 Brougham, Lord: his early advocacy of national education, i. 471; characteristic contemporary opposition to it, *ib*.  
 Broughton, Rhoda, as a novelist, ii. 406.  
 Browning, Mr., as a poet, ii. 397, 398.  
 Bureaux de Bienfaisance, their operations, i. 365.  
 Burglar, Operations of a practised, i. 412, 413.  
 Burial Boards, i. 95.  
 Burne Jones, Mr., as an artist, ii. 368—370.  
 Buxton: restrictions in building imposed by the Duke of Devonshire, i. 66, 67; as a watering-place, its special attractions, 186.
- O
- Cabinet Council, The: a meeting of, ii. 115; its procedure in legislation described, *ib*.  
 Cabs, London, i. 452, 453.  
 Cahill, Dr., testimony to the field employment of women, i. 325.  
 Caird, Mr., on the agricultural capabilities of England, i. 326.  
 Canal population, Need of legislation for, i. 258.  
 Canterbury, i. 174.  
 Capital, estimate of amount used in large businesses, i. 234, 235.  
 Carlton Club, The, ii. 63.  
 Carlyle, Thomas: his bias for German philosophy, ii. 352; as a writer, *ib*.; influence of his writings in the present day, 413.  
 Casual ward, The, its inmates and operations, i. 343.  
 Cathedral and chapter, The: the dean and his office, ii. 286; the canons, *ib*.; relation of the bishop to, 287.

- Cathedral city**, The: its aspect, i. 169; the close and its denizens, 171, 172; its social life, "Mrs. Proudie," 172.
- Caucus**, The: its introduction into England, ii. 77; its aims, uses, and evils, 77—84; Mr. Chamberlain upon it, 78; "the six hundred," *ib.*; its aspect in the United States, 79.
- Challenger Expedition**, Results of the, ii. 385.
- Chamberlain**, Mr. Joseph: on the Caucus, ii. 78; on the perfection of the polity of the United States, 79, 80.
- Chambers of commerce**, i. 124; influence wielded by members of Parliament over their action, *ib.*
- Charity**: treatment of charitable applications by great landowners, i. 46.
- Cheltenham**, i. 175.
- Chemistry as a profession**, ii. 452.
- Children**: State protection of, i. 248; birth in workhouse no disadvantage to the lowest classes, 344; career of the youthful criminal, 410; the clever boy, accidental nature of his education under old system, 464—466, advantages now offered, 466; effect of changed social life on parents and children, ii. 14, 15; predilection for the sea and advantages offered by a naval career, 230.
- Church of England** (*see also* The Rector): influence in parish affairs, i. 14, 15; results of the agitation of Dissent, 35, 36; allowably preferable in rural districts, 35, its influence in, 39, 40; responsibility of its defence lies with the clergy, 36; necessity of tolerance and common sense, 31, example of effect of tolerance, 40, 41; procedure in ecclesiastical courts, ii. 221—226; its numerous sects analogous in this respect to the Romish faith and Non-conformity, 268; statistics of services in London, 269, other signs of external activity, 270; her spiritual life, *ib.*; inspiration and other questions of the day and issues involved, 271. The Broad Church: Dean Stanley on the progress of theology, 273, on science and religion, 274, 275; theology and religion, 274; science and religion, difficulties of reconciliation, *ib.*; Mr. Jowett's theology, 275; Mr. M. Arnold's theology, 276. The High Church: 277—279; Canon Liddon, 279; common aspect of ritualism, 277; some of its peculiarities, 278; its occasional disregard of culture, 279; its attractions, 280. The Low Church: tendency and vitality of Evangelicalism, 280, 281. Tithes, 282; Queen Anne's bounty, 283; the archdeacon and his functions, 283—286; the churchwarden, 285; the cathedral and chapter, the dean and his office, 286, the canons, *ib.*, relation of the bishop to, 287, election of a bishop, 288; the rural dean and his office, 287; patronage, sale of advowsons and next presentations, 288.
- Church of Rome**, The: a missionary organisation directed by the congregation of the Propaganda, ii. 301; establishment of the English hierarchy, 302; organisation and rank of the clergy, *ib.*; its present influence not advancing except amongst the aristocracy, 303; failure to establish the Catholic University, *ib.*
- Churchwarden**, The, ii. 285.
- City Corporation**, The, i. 128.
- City guilds**: their estates and their management, i. 70.
- Civil engineering**: its attractions, ii. 451; youthful predilection for, 452.
- Civil Service Co-operative Society**: its origin, progress, and organisation, i. 394.



- Civil Service Supply Association**: the difficulties of membership, i. 381; its origin and progress, 390; organisation, 391—393; associated tradesmen, 392; extent of its operations, *ib.*; treatment of profits, 393.
- Clergy, The**: exceptional social status of, and its cause, ii. 42—47. (*See also* The Rector and The Church of England.)
- Cleveland, Duke of**: organisation of his estates at Darlington, i. 58, 59; at Raby Castle, i. 59—63; description of the property, 59; gradual and beneficial change to pasture, *ib.*; workshops at Raby Castle, 60, 61; method of securing royalty on mines, 63, 64.
- Clifton, i.** 175.
- Club, The**: club life in Manchester and Liverpool, i. 159, 160; club life in London, its political influence, ii. 58; its conditions and expense, 59; advantages of membership, 60; types of habitués, *ib.*; diverse customs prevalent, 61; political clubs, 61—64; the Carlton and Reform, 63, unwise action of, 61; the working man's club—its constitution, aims, and occupations, 426—430, its literature, 428, its aspect described, 427, 428, expected beneficial result of, 430.
- Coleridge, the** introducer of German philosophy, ii. 351—354.
- Collins, Mr. Wilkie, as a novelist**, ii. 403.
- Colonial Office, The**: its administration described, the Registry Office, ii. 100; duties of the Assistant, Permanent, and Parliamentary Under-Secretaries, 101—103, co-ordinate power of the two latter, 103; work of the Colonial Minister, 103—105.
- Colonies and the colonists**: prospects for the university graduate in, ii. 458; necessity to foster emigration, 482; prospects of the colonies, *ib.*; requirements of the emigrant, 483; Crown dependencies and self-governing colonies, 484; extent of British possessions in temperate regions, *ib.*; financial relations of the State and colonies, 485; extent of trade with, 486; patriotism of, 487; the suggested federation, 488; the State and the colonies, 488, 499, Burke thereon, 499; forces of cohesion, 489, 490; suggested extension of privileges to, *ib.*; features of colonial life, 491; colonial institutions, their nature and progress, 492; supremacy of democracy in, 493; political government, 494—496; position and policy of the governor, 495; social life, 497, 498; titles to consideration in, 497; respect for law, 498; colonial judges, 499; supremacy of physical power in, 497; the future of England in relation to, 501, 502.
- Commander-in-Chief.** (*See* The Army.)
- Commercial administration**: centralisation of authority in, i. 221; typical illustrations of—the cotton mill: process of manufacture, 222, purchase of raw cotton, 222—224, sale of cloth, 223, organisation of the factory, *ib.*, of the warehouse, *ib.*, the managing partner, his functions and control, 224, 225. An ironworks: its aspect 226, organisation in the works, 226, 227, at the mines, *ib.*, "the puddler," 228, sale of the iron, *ib.*, the managing partner, his functions and control, 229. A banking-house: its aspect, 229, process of business in, 230, functions of the partners, 230, 231, the managing partner, 231, the financial partner, *ib.*, its organisation, heads of departments, 232, 233. A banking-house and a bank contrasted, 233, functions of the former, 234; amount of capital engaged in large businesses, 234, 235; custom of delegated authority to one partner, 235, 236; needful watchfulness of the

- course of politics, 236, 237; advantages of rich concerns, 237; the gradual process of their construction, 238.
- Commercial England (*see also* Financial England and Commercial Administration): London the centre of commerce, i. 188; causes of depression and inflation of trade, 189, 217; cosmopolitan and gradual development of trade, 190; ramifications of, 188—191; commerce the first essential of prosperity, 205; our advantages in enterprise and skilled labour, *ib.*, in accumulated capital, 207, in free imports, 208; benefits accruing from manufacturing, 206; the textile trade, 207; inseparable connection with banking, 209; past prosperity and present depression, 210, 211, overtrading, 211, excess of imports—its causes, 212, 213, its lesson, 213, 214, the new theory of, 212, necessity of some stay in, 215, increase of luxury, 216, new fields of enterprise, 217, effects of the public-house, 218, reasons for hopefulness, *ib.*; values, not volume, of trade decreased, *ib.*; probable competition from the United States, *ib.*, from India, 219; evils of adulteration, 219, its abandonment a necessity, 220; capital engaged in, 234, 235; necessary watchfulness of politics, 236, 237; railway expenditure and income, 441; recent influx of the aristocracy, ii. 24, 25, 459; its prospects and lessened attractions as a career, 459; extent of trade with the colonies, 486.
- Commercial towns. (*See* Towns of Business.)
- Commissioner, The. (*See* The Land Agent.)
- Common sense: necessity of, in religious matters, i. 31; the Scotch philosophical school of, ii. 318.
- Commoner, The: social advantages possessed by, ii. 34; exceptional social rank sometimes achieved, *ib.*
- Competition in trade, Prospects of, i. 218, 219; from the United States, *ib.*; from India, *ib.*
- Competitive examination, i. 488, 489; the "crammer," 489; inducements held out to university graduates, *ib.*
- Compstall (Cheshire), a model manufacturing village, i. 148.
- Compulsory education, how enforced, i. 468; early objections to, 469; its strangeness to the Englishman, 470; practical beneficial results of, 469, 470.
- Comte, Auguste: his Positivist doctrines and their influence on English philosophy, ii. 321; G. H. Lewes's tribute to, 324.
- Congregationalists, or Independents. (*See* Nonconformity.)
- Conservative Club, The: unwise political action of, ii. 61.
- Conservatives, The: conservatism of the working man, i. 244; treatment of the rank and file by the leaders, ii. 63; their organisation, 82; prevalence of, in the Upper House, 188, 189.
- Constitutional monarchy (*see also* The Crown), its real position defined, ii. 85; the guarantees of its stability, ii. 86—88, 93.
- Controller of the Navy, The, his special duties, ii. 239.
- Convict, The. (*See* Prison and Prisoners.)
- Co-operation: the village co-operative store; its introduction and advantages, i. 307, an example, 308, 309, beneficial sale of beer by, 309; its incitement to thrift, 375; Rochdale and London: the Rochdale Pioneers, 377, 380, 381, the Army and Navy Stores, 378, 379, London and Rochdale stores contrasted, 382, 383; Civil Service Supply Association: difficulties of membership, 381, its origin, progress, and organisation, 390—393, its associated

- tradesmen, 392, extent of its operations, *ib.*, its profits, 393; the Co-operative Wholesale Society, 389; the Civil Service Co-operative Society, 394; the Army and Navy Co-operative Society: its progress, manufactures, and operations, 395—397; spuriousness of many associations, 382; advantages of co-operation to the higher classes, 384, to the working classes, 383—385, 398, 399; Mr. Jacob Holyoake thereon, 385, 399; effect of enthusiasm on co-operation, 386; Owen's failure and reasons, *ib.*; its claim to higher aims, 387, 388; its educational value, 400; its prospects, 401; general benefits of the movement, 404; the "Assington" agricultural co-operation, and its success, 402.
- Co-operative Wholesale Society, Operations of the, i. 389.
- Corporate bodies, Advantages of tenancy under, i. 331.
- Cottage, The: the modern cottage, i. 295; overcrowding, need of increase in number, 312; small returns on capital, 317.
- Cotton-mill, The: description of, i. 148—152; a day's toil at, 150—152; process of manufacture, 222; purchase of raw cotton, 222—224; sale of cloth, 223; organisation in the factory, *ib.*; in the warehouse, *ib.*; the managing partner, his functions and control, 224, 225; estimate of capital employed, 234, 235.
- Country house, The modern, ii. 13; constituents of social life in, 57, 58; disappearance of "the wit," 58.
- Country town, The. (*See The Town.*)
- County Court, The, ii. 217—221; facilities offered to suitors, 217; a representative case, "servant v. employer," 216—221; its aspect and procedure, 218, 219; typical cases in, 219—221; appeals from, 221.
- County suffrage, Possible results of, ii. 191.
- Court, The. (*See The Crown.*)
- "Crammer," The, i. 489.
- Crime: difficulties in estimating its origin and extent, i. 405, 406; improvement in legislation, 407; evils of transportation, 408; prevention and its difficulties, 409; benefits of reformatories and industrial schools, 409—411; career of the youthful criminal, 410, of the adult, 411, the burglar, 411—413; receivers and their frequent immunity, 413; criminals from the middle classes, and causes of crime, 416, 417; brutal crimes, 417, 418; the princes of crime: their career traced, 418—420, its similarity, 419; operations of the police, 421—427, defects and merits of, 421, the detective, 422—427, improvement in, 425; prosecution of a prisoner—the process, 427; effects of the Prison Act of 1877, 428, 429, treatment of the ordinary prisoner and of the convict, 430—433; discharged prisoners and the Aid Society, 434—436; decrease of, through education—statistics, 480—482; "theft from the person," procedure in, ii. 196—198; Dr. Maudsley on evolution of crime, 332, 333.
- Criticism. (*See Culture and Literature.*)
- Crown, The: disposition of the masses to accept political situation, ii. 69—71; enthusiasm for royalty, 71—73; docility of the modern "firebrand," 72; ovations to ministers, 73—75; the great leaders described, 75; Mr. Bagehot on the new and old constitution, 76; Lord Derby on the relation of the Government to the masses, "employers and employed," 84—86; supremacy of the democratic polity, 85; constitutional monarchy, its real aspect defined, *ib.*; checks on

- democracy, 86; guarantees of the stability of the Constitution, 86—88, 93; Mr. Bagehot on the relations of Sovereign to Cabinet, and of Parliament to the masses, 91, 92; the presidential system a temporary despotism, 92; approximation of classes in Government, and influences at work, 93; the Queen's prerogative, its vastness, but limited use, 94, 95, Mr. Bagehot thereon, *ib.*; services of a Sovereign, 95, and of a court, 96; monarchy and republic contrasted by Mr. Bagehot, 97; a Privy Council meeting described, 112, 113, the Premier and the Sovereign, 113, method of communication from ministers to the Queen described, 114, 115; probable results of county suffrage, 191, possible difficulties in strife between classes, 192; possible national calamities, 193; secure tenure of the Crown, 192, 193; patriotism of the colonies, 487; the suggested federation of the colonies, 488; the different power of democracy in the colonies, at home, and in the Crown dependencies, 493; the present and future of England, 500—504, specially in relation to the colonies, 501, 502.
- Crown dependencies, *ii.* 484; absence of democratic feeling in, 493.
- Culture (*see also* Painting, Music, Literature, and Science), æstheticism in modern houses, *ii.* 357—359; a sex in taste, femininity of the period in decorations and literature, 358; debt of art to Prince Consort, 360, to Ruskin, 361; School of Art, South Kensington, *ib.*; æstheticism in female dress and recreations, 363, 364; art criticism: Mr. Ruskin, Mr. Hamerton, Mr. Pater, Mr. Augustus Hare, 373; art patronage, 375: the State and art, *ib.*, schools of design, *ib.*; rapid spread of musical culture, 377; influence of Matthew Arnold and Max Müller on æsthetic thought, 394; summary of the results of culture, 392—394.

## D

- Dairy farms, Increase in number of, *i.* 329.
- Darwin: philosophy of, *ii.* 348, 349; "Origin of Species," 349; his theory of evolution and its wide influence, 350.
- Democracy: its part in the structure of society, *ii.* 22; a democratic polity now established, 85; checks upon democracy, 86; its force, first, in the colonies, secondly, at home, thirdly, in the Crown dependencies, 493; what use will it make of its power? 503, 504.
- Depression and inflation in trade, causes of, *i.* 189, 210—211, 217—220.
- Derby, Lord, on the Ministry and the masses, "employer and employed," *ii.* 84—88.
- Design, schools of, *ii.* 375.
- Devonshire, Duke of: works at Chatsworth, *i.* 64; customs on the Devonshire estates, 64, 65, farms let on annual agreement and re-valuation, 65, comparative fixity of tenure, *ib.*, organisation of, 66; restrictions on building at Buxton and Eastbourne, 66, 67.
- Diet of the rural labourer, *i.* 296, 302; the milk diet in Northumberland, 332.
- Diplomacy: as a profession, *ii.* 465—467; necessity of wealth and position to its followers, 466; its peculiarities, 467; diplomatic establishment, *see* Foreign Office.
- Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society, Beneficial operations of, *i.* 435.
- Dissent. (*See* Nonconformity.)
- Diversity of the working classes, a guarantee of order, *i.* 241—243.

Doctor, The. (*See* The Medical Profession.)

Dod on precedence, ii. 29.

Domesticity: effects of changed social life on, ii. 14, 15; fashionable parents and children, *ib.*; present feminine independence, 17.

Drama, The. (*See* The Stage.)

Du Maurier, Mr., as an artist, ii. 379; "the music of the future," *ib.*

Durham, i. 173.

## E

Earnestness of an Englishman's pursuits, ii. 38.

Eastbourne: the Duke of Devonshire's properties there, i. 54; his restrictions on building, 66, 67.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners, The: are the largest landowners, i. 69; management of their estates, *ib.*

Ecclesiastical courts, The procedure in, ii. 221—226.

Economy of force, a feature of the present age, i. 9, 10.

Education (*see also* School Boards, Universities, and Schools): the village school and its advantages, i. 295; prospective effect on the peasant, 340; benefits derived from co-operation, 400; the clever boy: accidental method of his advancement under the old system, 464—466, his patrons, 465, advantages now offered, 466—468, the School Board and its procedure, 466—484, compulsory education, 468—470; State and voluntary aid under the old régime, 470, 471; Education Acts of 1870 and 1876, 469, operations of the former, 472—474; Lord Brougham's advocacy of national education and characteristic contemporary opposition, 471; progress of State control, 472; secular and religious teaching, 473, this question debated, 508; aims of the Education Department, 474; generally unsatisfactory results of learning by rote, 477—480; the working man's ignorance of the economy of life, 479; decrease of crime resulting from education shown by statistics, 480—482; present vast expenditure, 483, 484; grammar schools, endowed schools, and public schools, 486—488; competitive examinations and the "crammer," 488, 489, inducements held out to university graduates, 489; recent advance made by the universities—middle-class examinations, professorial chairs, unattached students, 490—492; conferences of schoolmasters, 493, the College of Preceptors, *ib.*, types of inefficient masters, 495, 496; necessity for secondary schools, 494; inefficiency of school education, *ib.*; direct and indirect inspection of school, and great value of the latter, 497; responsibility of parents, stimulated neglect of learning, and preference for play, 498; organisation of the public schools, 499—502; increased sense of responsibility of the modern boy, 503; the higher teaching of girls, and doubtful result, 505, 506; organisation the key of the present system, 507; universality secured, *ib.*; when State grants become denominational endowments, 508; the education of the soldier, ii. 255.

Education Act, The: compared to the Corporations Act, i. 105; intimate connection with factory legislation, 259—263; satisfactory result of, 261; reforms necessary, 262; abuse of, where manufacturing and agriculture overlap, 262, 263; its relation to School Boards and operation, 469, 472—474.

Education Office, The: in relation to the rector, i. 21; aim of the department in respect to School Boards, 474.

## INDEX.

- Edwards, Rev. W. W.**, on Acts of Parliament in relation to friendly societies, i. 371; suggested reforms, 373.
- Efficiency**, a necessity of colonial and professional success, ii. 451.
- "Elberfield experiment, The,"** i. 365.
- Eleusis Club**, Advanced propaganda of, i. 242.
- Eliot, George**: her works an instance of the invasion of science into literature, ii. 389; her novels, 405; her doctrine of "the religion of humanity," 415, 416; parallel teaching of John Morley, *ib.*
- Embankments, The Thames**, i. 132.
- Emigration.** (*See The Colonies.*)
- Employer and employed**: moderation of the latter, i. 279; example, the cotton famine, *ib.*; instances in contrast, the Nottingham frame-breakers, 280, 281; rarity of violence in our time, 282.
- Enclosure Commissioners, The**, i. 329.
- Endowed Schools Act, The**, i. 486.
- Engineer, The mining**, i. 272.
- Equity and law defined**, ii. 206, 207; their amalgamation through recent reforms, 207.
- Established Church.** (*See Church of England.*)
- Estates, Landed.** (*See Landlord.*)
- Evangelicalism.** (*See The Church of England.*)
- Evolution.** (*See Philosophy.*)
- Excellence of some kind**, a necessity through life, ii. 38.
- Exeter**, i. 173; its special attractions to residents, 174.

## F

- Factory legislation**: state protection of women and children, i. 248; excessive interference a blunder, 249; its progress traced, 250—259; benefit of limited hours, 253; summary of Factory Acts, 253, 254 (*footnote*); connection with the Education Act, 259—263; beneficial results of, 268—270, Mr. Redgrave thereon, *ib.*
- Factory operative, The**: predominance of, in Lancashire towns, i. 145; his intelligence, his singular indulgences, 146; his recreations—curious examples, 147; early marriages and their effect, 146; his day's work described, 148—152; extraordinary independence of, 161; progress of factory legislation, 250—257; its beneficial results, 253, 268—270; his physical deterioration and its causes, 146, 270, 271.
- Fagging and the prefect**, i. 500—502.
- Families hired as field labourers**, curious customs, i. 323.
- Farmer, The**: different types of, i. 36; a modern farmer's family, 38; his relation to the Board of Guardians, 76, 77; doubtful results of peasant proprietorship, 319; effects of Acts of husbandry and rotation of crops, 325; advantages of the large farmer, 326; Mr. Caird on the agricultural capabilities of England, *ib.*; disappearance of the yeomen, 327; increased number of dairy-farms and market-gardens, 329; speculative remedies, re-distribution of land, 330; tenancy under corporate bodies, 331; tolerance of the labourer to the farmer, 339.
- Female independence**: is the result of our changed social life, ii. 17; its effect in the present day, 20; possible ultimate benefit of, 21.
- Feudal customs at Woburn Abbey**, i. 49; rarity of, to-day, 48, 49.

- Financial England**: conventional mystery of money market and credit, i. 187; London the centre, 188; impossibility to trace finance from general to particular, 189; causes of depression and inflation, *ib.*; cosmopolitan and gradual development of, 190; its wide ramifications, 188—191. The Bank of England: its primary functions, 192, its exceptional functions, 193, its relation to other banks, *ib.* London, the international clearing-house, 194, has replaced Amsterdam in this function, *ib.*, reasons of its growth, 195. The Stock Exchange, its operations, 196, its aspect, 197, investment business, 198, gambling or speculative business, 198, 199, issue of a foreign loan, 200—203, deceptions practised towards the public, 202, 203; inseparable connection between banking and commerce, 209; the financial partner in a banking-house, 231; a banking-house and a bank contrasted, 233, functions of the former, 234.
- Fine arts**, Cultivation of, in towns of business, i. 137, 138. (*See also* Culture.)
- Flats**, Life in: Victoria Street, Westminster, ii. 4; its advantages, 5.
- Forces**, strength of the army, ii. 262.
- Foreign loans**: process of issue, i. 200—203; deceptions practised on the public, 202, 203.
- Foreign Office**, The: its administration, ii. 106—109; secrecy necessary 106; the departments, 107; organisation of the Treaty Department, 108, 109; the Diplomatic Establishment and its privileges, the St. James's Club, 107, 108; numerous troublesome applications to, 125, 126.
- France**: the French artisan in his relation to the State, i. 246, compared with that of the English, 247; effect of intercourse with, on our social life, ii. 3, the imprint of French habits, 3, cases in which overdone, 6, 7, its effect on the stage, 7, on the relations of the sexes, 8, on marriage, 14—17; its influence on literature, 413, on the writings of Mr. Frederic Harrison and Mr. John Morley, *ib.*; influence of the French school on our stage, 433, French domestic morality unsuitable to English actors and audiences, 438—441; French plays in London commonly have limited audiences, 448; French and English newspapers and journalism contrasted, 473, 474.
- Fraser**, Dr. (Bishop of Manchester): on defects in the Sanitary Act, 314; on overcrowding and propagation of disease, 315; on allotments, 318; on employment of women in agriculture, 323.
- Free discussion**, Beneficial results of, i. 241.
- Free trade**: benefits of free imports, i. 208, excess of, its causes, 212, 213. its lesson, 213, 214, the new theory, 212, values, not volume, of trade decreased, 218.
- Freeman**, Mr., as an historian, ii. 411.
- Friendly societies**: the village benefit society, i. 24; Government actuarial tables, 367; necessity of the co-operation of employers, instances and difficulties, 368, 369; their relation to the state, 370; Acts of Parliament, *ib.*; their extent, 371; benefits accruing to members, *ib.*; suggestion for State control, 372; Mr. W. W. Edwards upon them, 371, 373; penny banks, 374; statistics, 376 (*footnote*).
- Frugality** of the Yorkshire manufacturer, i. 139.
- Future of England**, The, discussed, ii. 501—504; and especially in relation to the colonies and Greater Britain, 501, 502.

## G

- Garden, A, preferable to the allotment, i. 318.  
 Germany: influence of German thought on the philosophy of to-day, ii. 351—354, introduced by Coleridge, 352, fostered by Carlyle, *ib.*, influence of Hegel, 354; growing influence of its music, Liszt, Wagner, 379.  
 Girls, The higher teaching of, i. 505; its doubtful results, 506.  
 Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E.: ovation to, by the masses described, ii. 74, 75; on the duty of the Premier to his colleagues, 113.  
 Government, Imperial. (*See* The State.)  
 Grammar schools, the advantage offered by, in certain towns, i. 485.  
 Great landowners. (*See* Landlords.)  
 Great officers of State, their titles to precedence, ii. 31.  
 Greater Britain. (*See* Imperial England.)  
 Guardians, Board of, i. 74; claims of candidates, 74, 76; privilege of ratepayers, 74; its duties, 76; influence of the rector and farmer, 76, 77; desirable reforms, 80; a scene in a board-room, 80—82, composition of the board, *ib.*, its labours described, 86; importance of sanitary duties, 83, 84; effects of whims, 84.

## H

- Hamerton, Mr. P. G., as an art critic, ii. 373.  
 Hardy, Mr., as a novelist, ii. 408.  
 Harley, Mr., testimony to the employment of women in field labour, i. 324.  
 Harrison, Mr. Frederic: on the relation of the French artisan to the State, i. 247; as a Positivist, ii. 323; influence of French thought on his writings, 413; on the press and its power, 473.  
 Hegel, influence of his writings on English thought, ii. 354.  
 High Church, The. (*See* Church of England.)  
 Highland railway, Eccentricities of travel on a, i. 444.  
 Highway boards, i. 95.  
 History and historians: Mr. Wyon, Mr. Spencer Walpole, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Justin McCarthy, ii. 410—412; earnings of the historian, 471.  
 Hoey, Mrs. Cashel, as a novelist, ii. 404.  
 Holyoake, Mr. Jacob: "History of Co-operation," i. 385; on the benefits accruing to the working classes from co-operation, 398, 399.  
 Hotels: the modern hotel, its advantages and disadvantages, i. 458—463; gradual absorption of small inns, 458; "Hatchett's," 459; Covent Garden hotels, 460; table d'hôte, 460—463, its unsuitability to the ordinary Englishman, *ib.*, the hotel drawing-room, 462.  
 House of Commons: the process of parliamentary reform, ii. 76; connects Queen and Cabinet with the masses, 91; decrease in desire for a seat in, 127, reasons, opportunities offered by literature—the review the platform of the individual, 128; membership does not necessarily confer social distinction, 130, its value, 131, interesting nature of its duties, *ib.*, its attractions, *ib.*, its severe labours, 132, duties of members to constituencies, 133; Mr. Palgrave's "The House of Commons," 131, 153, 157; comparative independence of representatives of small constituencies, 154; a day in the House, 184—141, 144—147, 150—158, its procedure, *ib.*, its denizens, 136, private business, 137, petitions, 138, aspect of the House and its members, 139—142, age of members, 143, decrease of the aristocracy in, *ib.*, a question of privilege, 145, its oratory, 146,



- 147, 163—167, Mr. Bright as an orator, 167, loss of classic oratory and reasons, 164—167; the whip and his functions, 147—149; the division, 150, progress of a Bill, 151—154; action of the Lords, 155; royal assent, 155, 156; the Speaker, his duties and privileges, 156—162; rules and practices of the House, 158, 159; its staff and their duties, 162, 163; supply committees, 161; rights of private members, *ib.*; select committees, 163; essentials of popularity, 168; rarity of collision between the two Houses, 172.
- House of Lords: its importance below that of the Commons, *ii.* 169, exceptionally superior to, 170, 171; its increasing influence, 171; rarity of collisions between the two Houses—instances, 172, 173; difficulties of aspirants in, 174; an afternoon in the House, 175—185, exterior and interior aspect of, 175—177, its members, 177, their comparative impassibility, 178—180, its procedure, *ib.*, the Speaker, 177, a debate, 177—183, oratory, 182, 183, compared with that of the Commons, 186, the *imperium in imperio*, 181, unique position of Lord Redesdale as Chairman of Committees, 184; rules and practices, *ib.*, the divisions, 185, elements for the perpetuation of the aristocracy, 186; possible reforms in, 187; influence and authority of its members, 188—190; prevalence of Conservatism, *ib.*; possible results of county suffrage, 191; aspect as a court of appeal, 214, 215, life peers, 214.
- Howell, Mr. George, on the earnings and expenses of the working classes, *i.* 375.
- Husbandry, Acts of, and their effect, *i.* 325.
- Huxley, Professor: his method and services, *ii.* 380—383; on “the protoplasm,” 382; opposition offered by Mr. St. George Mivart, 386.
- I
- Imperial England: encouragement of emigration, *ii.* 482; our Crown dependencies and self-governing colonies, 484; extent of our possessions in temperate regions, *ib.*, attractions to emigrants of English-speaking communities, 485; financial relations with the colonies, 485; extent of trade with, 486; their patriotism, 487; the suggested federation, 488; the State and the colonies, 488, 499, Burke thereon, 499; forces of cohesion, 489, 490; suggested grant of privileges to, *ib.*; influence of democracy, (1) in the colonies, (2) at home, (3) in Crown dependencies, 493; position and policy of the governor of a colony, 495; the present and future of England in relation to the colonies and Greater Britain, 501, 502.
- Imperial Government. (*See The State.*)
- Imports, Excess of: its cause, *i.* 212, 213; its lesson, 213, 214; the new theory, 212; necessity of its arrest, 215.
- Independents, The (or Congregationalists). (*See Nonconformity.*)
- India, as a profession, *ii.* 478—481; benefits accrued from throwing open the career, 479, 480; certain resulting defects, 480; the competition wallah, 479—481.
- India Office, The: its administration, *ii.* 105, 106; action of the Indian Council, 106; numerous troublesome applications to, 122.
- Inflation and depression of trade, Causes of, *i.* 189, 210, 211, 217—220.
- Industrial schools, Beneficial result of, *i.* 409, 411.
- Inn, The: its absorption by large hotels, *i.* 458.
- Irish element in Liverpool and unskilled labour, *i.* 152, 153.

**Ironworks, An:** its aspect, 226; organisation in the works, 226, 227, at the mines, *ib.*; the "puddler," 228; sale of iron, *ib.*; the managing partner, his functions, and control, 229; estimate of capital employed, 234, 235.

## J

**Jews, The:** their numbers, ii. 304; sectarian differences, 305; the Reformed English Synagogue, ritual and belief, 307; toleration of other faiths, *ib.*; marriage, *ib.*; aversion to proselytism, 308; absorption in nations, 309; the Rabbi, 310; training for the priesthood, 311; education of the young, *ib.*; provision for the poor, 312.

**Journalism:** occupation and earnings of the journalist, ii. 471, 472; the special correspondent, 476; features and prospects of, 476—478.

**Jowett, Mr.,** Theology of, ii. 275.

**Justices of the peace.** (*See* Magistrates.)

## K

**Kensington:** old and new Kensington, i. 132, 133; necessity for tree protection, 133.

## L

**Labourer, The.** (*See* The Artisan and The Agricultural Labourer.)

**Lancashire** (*see also* Manchester and Liverpool): improvements in the last sixty years, i. 136, 137; regularity of factory earnings, and necessary beneficial result, 142; the factory hand, his intelligence and habits, 145—147; smaller manufacturing towns—Blackburn, Staleybridge, &c., 147; the manufacturing village—Compstall in Cheshire, 148; description of a cotton-mill, a day's work, 148—152; greater opportunities of popular amusement in northern counties, ii. 423, 424.

**Land agent, The:** duties of the Duke of Northumberland's commissioner, i. 56—58; bailiwicks and agents on the property, 57; advantages of the control of a superior agent, 71.

**Landed estates.** (*See* Landlord.)

**Landlord, The:** conventional estimate of the occupations of the great landowner, its errors, i. 42, 43; the actual creditable fulfilment of his duties, 44; his responsibilities, 45; daily routine life of, 45—47; his treatment of charitable requests, 46; organisation and administration of vast estates, 47—71; completeness of accounts and checks upon them, 47, 48; feudal customs rarely seen, 48, 49; feudal customs at Woburn Abbey, 49; the Duke of Westminster's estate (Eaton), organisation of, 50, security of tenure of the workmen employed, *ib.*; Duke of Northumberland's estate (Alnwick Castle), organisation of, 51, 52, Tynemouth excavations, 52, Tynemouth, 52, 53, the ducal interests represented on the commission, 52, vast properties of the Northumberland estate, 54—56, the farms upon it, 55, 56, duties of the chief commissioner, 56—58, bailiwicks and agents, 57; the Duke of Cleveland's estates (*see* Cleveland, Duke of); Duke of Devonshire's estates (*see* Devonshire, Duke of); archives, their variety and extent, 67, 68; general condition of leases, 68, 69; lands of Crown and Ecclesiastical Commissioners (the largest landowners), 69, the system of their management, *ib.*; lands of the City guilds, their management, 70; smaller estates, their general management, 70, 71; advantages of the control of a superior agent, 71; influence of great landlords, ubiquitous, 53; the close and open village,

- 315 (*footnote*); increased sense of responsibility, 316; effect of abolition of old Poor Law, 317; small returns of cottage property, *ib.*; Acts of Husbandry, 325; gradual passing of estates from poor men, 317; agricultural area of England, how held, 327; political influence, *ii.* 49.
- Land question**, The: doubtful result of peasant proprietorship, 319; different habits of French and English peasants, *ib.*; agricultural area of England, 327, how held, *ib.*; small squires and yeomen disappearing, *ib.*; limited State interference, the Enclosure Commissioners, 329; speculative remedy, redistribution of land, 330.
- Law and equity defined**, *ii.* 206; their amalgamation under recent reform, 207.
- Law courts**, The: the police court and its procedure, *ii.* 194—196, nature of cases brought before it, 197, 198, a representative case, "theft from the person," 196—198; Quarter Sessions, aspect of, 199—202, its grand jury and procedure, 199, cases brought before it, 200, 201, questions of law, 202, 203; Court for Crown Cases Reserved, its procedure and disabilities, 203; advantages of a final court of appeal, *ib.*; ordinary litigation and its difficulties, a representative case, "a repairing lease," 204—215, the preliminaries, 204, pleadings, 205, interrogatories, 207, trial at Westminster, 208—211; appeal to Divisional Court, 212, appeal to the House of Lords and final judgment, 214, 215; law and equity, definition of, 206, beneficial amalgamation of, by recent reforms, 207; Judges' Chambers, *ib.*; Queen's counsel, "silk" and "stuff," 208, 209; typical cases at Westminster Hall, 209; the Divisional Court, 212; dress of the judges, 212, 213; the House of Lords and life peers, 214, 215; national aversion to law, 215—217; the County Court, 217—221, facilities offered to suitors, 217, a representative case, servant and employer, 216—221; County Court procedure, 218, its aspect, 219, typical cases, 219—221, appeal from, 221; ecclesiastical courts and their procedure, 221—226; Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, its aspect and constitution, 224, typical cases, 225; transitional state of the law courts, 226, 227; their advance with the times, 227; suggested modifications, *ib.*; colonial judges, 499.
- Leamington**, *i.* 175, 176.
- Leases**, General conditions of, on large estates, *i.* 68, 69.
- Leeds**. (*See* Yorkshire.)
- Legislation**, Modern: effects of, *i.* 5; state protection of women and children, 248; excessive interference a blunder, 249; progress of recent factory legislation traced, 250—259; reforms still needful, 254—258, 264—266; summary of factory legislation, 253 (*footnote*), results of it, 253, 254, 268—270; legislation in shops, 259; results of the Education Act, 259—263; the truck system not yet abolished, 264, 265; necessity of elasticity in application, 267; mining legislation, 272; legislation for friendly societies, 370; improvement in criminal legislation, 407; beneficial effect of the Prison Act, 428, 429; railway enactments, 445, the Railway Commissioners, 447; method of procedure in legislation on the part of the Cabinet, *ii.* 115.
- Lewes**, G. H.: his Positivism, tribute to Comte, *ii.* 324; his philosophy, 345—348; "History of Philosophy," 345; contempt for metaphysics, 346; excellence of his style and method, 347.
- Liberals**, The: the treatment of the rank and file by the leaders, *ii.* 63.

**Licenser of Plays, The**: his functions described, ii. 441—448; defence of his office, *ib.*

**Life in the nineteenth century.** (*See The Present Age.*)

**Lister, Mr.**, his recent and rapidly growing influence in physiology, ii. 384; advocacy of "antiseptic treatment," 384, 462.

**Literature**: exceptional social status of the author and its cause, ii. 44—47; openings offered to politicians, ii. 128, 129, the review the platform of the individual, 128; Carlyle as a writer, 352; invasion of, by psychology, 387, by physiology, instanced in the writings of George Eliot, 388, 389; popularity of manuals, 395; Mr. Arnold's writings, 396; modern extension of literary criticism, 395; Mr. Pater, Mr. Symonds, and Professor Shairp as critics, 396. Modern poetry and poets; Browning, 397, 398, Swinburne, 397, Tennyson, 398, 399, Alfred Austin, "The Human Tragedy," 399, 400, Mortimer Collins, 398. Novel readers, 401; novels and novelists, good and bad novels, 402; Anthony Trollope, *ib.*, Edmund Yates, *ib.*, Charles Reade, 403, Wilkie Collins, *ib.*; lady novelists—Mrs. Oliphant, Mrs. Lynn Linton, Mrs. Cashel Hoey, 404, "Ouida," 405, Miss Braddon, Miss Broughton, 406, George Eliot's novels, 405; George Macdonald's novels, 407; idyllic novels—Mr. Hardy, Mr. Blackmore, Mr. Black, 407, 408. Travel and biography: Mr. Trevelyan's "Life of Macaulay," Mr. Sims' "Life of Lessing," 409. Theological literature: writings of John Henry Newman, of Dean Stanley, Canon Farrar, 410. History and historians, 411; Public Record Office and services of Professor Stubbs, 412; influence of Carlyle, 413, of the French school, *ib.*; writings of Mr. John Morley, 414—416; popularity of the magazine and serial, 416; literature considered as a profession, 470—472; universality of writing in the present day, 471; estimated gains of the poet, novelist, historian, and philosopher, 472; the journalist, his duties, and income, 471; the daily press, its influence, economy, and features, 472—476; the weekly press, 476; characteristics and prospects of modern journalism, 476—478.

**Litigation**: its difficulties—a representative case, "the repairing lease," ii. 204—215; popular aversion to law, 215—217.

**Little, Mr. H. J.**, on the rural labourer, i. 301, 303, 316; on agricultural wages, 332; on the intelligence of the Northumberland peasant, 336; on the prospects of the field labourer, 340.

**Littre, M.**, as a Positivist, ii. 322.

**Liverpool**: a capital of commerce yet centre of culture, i. 137; cultivation of the fine arts, 137, 138; contrasted with Manchester, 145—148, 157—160; diverse population of, 152, 153; the nautical and foreign element, 152; immigration from Ireland, 152, 153, unskilled labour in, 153; its popular recreations, 154; cosmopolitan character of, 155; advantages accruing from intercourse with foreign countries, *ib.*; its society and recreations: Wellington rooms, Aintree and Altcar, 156, 157; its clubs, 159, 160; stringent police rule, 161; the American "bar," its introduction and evils, *ib.*; excellence of educational institutions, the press, and theatres, 162; the river and docks, 163.

**Loans** to municipalities, how raised, and securities against excess, i. 111, 112; the Public Works Loan Commissioners, 111. (*See also Foreign Loans.*)

- Local Acts of Parliament** : large number of, i. 104 ; their scope and prospective increase, 105.
- Local Board, The** : a connecting-link between rural and municipal administration, i. 100 ; its duties, *ib.*
- Local Government Board** : its controlling power, i. 110 ; its method of action, 111.
- London** : comparative impotence of the London ratepayer, 127 ; scheme for a metropolitan municipality, 128, its present constituents and costliness of the system, 128, 129, operations of the vestries described, 129, beneficial action of the Board of Works, *ib.*, difficulties of establishing a municipality and suggested alternative, 130, 131, success of the School Board, 130 ; London improvements, the embankments, 132, old and new Kensington, 132, 133, the parks, 133, necessity of tree protection, *ib.* ; the toiling population only partly visible, 143, 144 ; the centre of commerce and finance, 188, the international clearing-house in succession to Amsterdam, 194 ; peculiarities of the London artisan, 289—292 ; vehicles in, 452, 453 ; the season, ii. 13 ; popular amusements in, 424, 426.
- Lord Chamberlain, The**, as Licensor of Plays, his functions described, and defence of his office, ii. 441—448.
- Lord Chancellor** : appointments to the magistracy. i. 88, 89 ; his position in the House of Lords, ii. 177.
- Lord Lieutenant** : his influence in rural administration, i. 77, 78 ; evils of absenteeism, 79 ; appointment of magistrates, 88, 89.
- Love, Herbert Spencer's analysis of the passion of**, ii. 340.
- Low Church, The**. (*See The Church of England.*)
- Lynn Linton, Mrs.**, as a novelist, ii. 404.

## M

- McCarthy, Mr. Justin**, as a novelist, ii. 404 ; as an historian, 411.
- Macdonald, Dr. George**, as a novelist, ii. 407.
- Magistracy, The** : high estimation of the office of Justice of the Peace, i. 87, 88, curious advertisement, 88 ; method of appointment by Lord Lieutenant and Lord Chancellor, 88, 89 ; influence of political and religious bias, *ib.* ; the village reeve and port reeve, 93 ; popular election and gradual desuetude of it, 93, 94 ; objections to the unpaid magistracy, 96—99 ; difficulties of decision in trivial cases, 98 ; legal qualifications in ancient times, 96 ; provincial aldermen not magistrates, 119 ; qualifications and disqualifications of borough magistrates, 120, chiefly elected for political reasons, 121, evils of the process, 122, protests of certain towns against, *ib.*
- Manchester** : first to use Corporation Act, i. 104 ; improvement in the last sixty years, 136, 137 ; a capital of commerce but centre of culture, 137 ; cultivation of the fine arts in, 137, 138 ; the plutocrat not supreme, 138 ; visible predominance of the toiling population, 143, 144 ; "the factory hand," prevalence of, 145, his habits, 145—147 ; Manchester and Liverpool contrasted, 145—148, 157—160, permanence of families in, and reasons, 154 ; Manchester toilettes and entertainments, 157, recreations, balls and concerts, 156—158 ; revolution in the hours of business, 159, early dinners, *ib.* ; its clubs, 159, 160 ; affected patois of the millowner, 160 ; excellence of educational institutions, 162, of the press, *ib.*, of the theatres, *ib.* ; contrasted with Birmingham, 167.

**Manufacturing.** (*See* Commercial England.)

**Marines, The:** their duties, ii. 234, 235; essentially a *corps d'élite*, *ib.*

**Market-gardens,** increase in number of, i. 329.

**Marriage and married life,** Effects of French habits on, ii. 8, 14—17.

**Martineau, Miss,** on Positivism, ii. 315.

**Masses, The.** (*See* The People.)

**Match trade, the,** Need of legislation for, i. 256.

**Maudsley, Dr.,** on mental phenomena, ii. 331—333; on the evolution of crime, 332, 333.

**Mayoralty, The:** functions, honourable position, and unceasing duties of a Mayor, i. 117, 118; idem of the Lord Mayor of London, 118, 119.

**Medical profession, The** (*see also* Physiology): social status of the doctor, ii. 46; considered as a profession, its prospects, 460, estimated gains of, 461, its perils, 463, instances of sacrifice, 461; the antiseptic treatment, 462.

**Melbourne, Lord:** characteristic opposition to national education, i. 471.

**Members of Parliament** (*see also* House of Commons): their influence in chambers of commerce and trade councils, i. 124, 125; their policy towards industrial electors defined, 126; working men in Parliament, 289; large number of public school men, 504; decline in demand for the career and reasons, ii. 127—130; increased social distinction not absolute, 130; value and attractions of a seat, 131, interesting nature of the occupation, *ib.*, severity of the labours, 131—133; duties to constituencies, 133; greater freedom of representatives of small constituencies, 134; age of members, 143; oratory in the House, 146, 147, 163—167; advantages of unpaid membership, 465; politics as a profession, *ib.*

**Merchant, The:** the merchant prince of to-day and yesterday, ii. 24; social status of, 40—42, contrasted with that of the stock-broker, *ib.*; lessened attractions and promise of a mercantile career, 459. (*See also* Commercial England and Commercial Administration.)

**Mersey:** the river Mersey and its docks, i. 163.

**Metaphysics:** subordinated to philosophy, ii. 318; G. H. Lewes' contempt for, 346.

**Methodists, or Wesleyans.** (*See* Nonconformity.)

**Metropolis, The.** (*See* London.)

**Metropolitan Board of Works,** i. 128; benefits conferred by, 130.

**Middle-class crime and its causes,** i. 416, 417.

**Middle-class examinations,** i. 491, 492.

**Militia, The:** its importance, ii. 258, 259; growing esteem of, *ib.*

**Milk-diet:** value of the cow to the Northumbrian peasant, i. 332.

**Mill, John Stuart:** philosophy of, ii. 324—331; his special training, 325; on utilitarianism and its uses, 329—331; on Mr. Bain's method, 343.

**Millstone works,** Need of legislation for, i. 266.

**Mining engineer, The,** i. 272.

**Mining population, The:** excess and irregularity of wages account for absence of thrift, i. 142; Yorkshire miners a fine race, 143; mining legislation, 272, the mining engineer, *ib.*; varieties of the miner, 273, 274; social life of, 275—277, better aspect of, 276; career of the apprentice "putting," 278, of the miner "hewing," *ib.*

**Mivart, Mr. St. George,** his opposition to Huxley and Tyndall, ii. 386.

**Moderation of the working classes in times of trouble,** i. 279.

- Morley, Mr. John**, on Positivism, ii. 316; influence of French thought on his writings, 413; his works, 413—416; "Compromise," 414; a preacher with George Eliot of the religion of "humanity," 415, 416.
- Müller, Max**, his influence on religious thought, ii. 394.
- Mundella, Mr.**, his early advocacy of arbitration, i. 284.
- Municipal Corporation Act, The**, i. 104; first adopted in Manchester, *ib.*
- Municipal government**: the Local Board a connecting-link between town and country, i. 100, its duties, 100, 101; imperceptible growth of village into town, 101, country towns and country villages contrasted, 101—103; desire for independence, 103; the Municipal Corporation Act of 1833, 104, first applied in Manchester, *ib.*; vast number of local Acts of Parliament, *ib.*, their scope and prospective increase, 105; influence of School Boards, *ib.*, increased zeal of the citizen, 105, 106; the Town Council, its constitution and duties, 106, 107, the administration described—the municipal offices, 108, the committees, 109, the aldermen, *ib.*; contact of imperial and local government, *ib.*, power and action of the Local Government Board, 110, 111; municipal loans, how raised, 111, 112, the Public Works Loan Commissioners, 111, provision against any excess, 112; aspect of a Town Council, 113, its training, good and bad, 116, 117, functions, position, and unceasing duties of the mayor, 117—119, *idem* of the Lord Mayor of London, 117, 118; influence of politics in municipal affairs, 123; comparative impotence of the London ratepayer, 127; scheme for a metropolitan municipality, 128, its present constituents—the City Corporation, the Westminster authorities, the vestries, the Board of Works, *ib.*, costliness of the system, 129, difficulties of establishing a municipality, 130, and suggested alternative, 131; operations of the vestries described, 129; beneficial action of the Board of Works, 130, recent metropolitan improvements, 132, 133.
- Music**: encouraged by the Prince Consort, ii. 376; its widely increasing influence, 377; modern English composers, *ib.*; growing influence of Germany—Liszt, Wagner, 379, Wagner's *Tannhauser*, *ib.*; Du Maurier on the "music of the future," 378.
- Music-hall, The**: its good and evil influences, ii. 425; probable good results of the coffee music-halls, *ib.*; its influence on the stage, 434.

## N

- Navy, The**: social status of officers, ii. 46, 47; national importance of, 228, 229; nautical aptitude of the nation our chief security, 230, predilection of youth for the sea, *ib.*; advantages of a naval career, *ib.*; the life of the blue-jacket—training as a boy, 230—232, as an A. B., 233, as a non-commissioned officer, *ib.*; the marines—their duties, 234, 235, essentially a *corps d'élite*, 235; other classes constituting the personnel of a man-o'-war, *ib.*; the life of the officer—as a cadet, 235, 236, as an officer, 237; commissioned rank, *ib.*; officers of other branches, *ib.*; aspect of a man-o'-war, 238; administration—the Admiralty, 238—240, constitution of the Board, 239, its unique independence, 240, the Controller and his duties, 239; our naval force, 240 (*footnote*).
- Newcastle-on-Tyne**, i. 163; its factories and antiquities, 164; altered course of the river, 164, 165.

## INDEX.

Newman, John Henry, his theological writings, ii. 410.

Newspapers. (*See The Press.*)

"Noblesse," The: our aristocracy not "noblesse," ii. 26; extreme exclusiveness of, in Austria, 26, 27; Princess Esterhazy an instance, 27; comparison of the system with association of diverse ranks in our society, 28, 29.

Nonconformity: its admission of the importance of the rector and his work, i. 26, 32; its objections to him and the Established Church, 32—34; results of the agitation of Dissent, 35, 36; Dissent in rural districts, and in towns, its influence in the latter, 38—40; debt due to it by religion, 40; its attitude to the Church, and resulting responsibility of the clergy, 36; prevalence in Yorkshire households, 140; the sects of, ii. 289; position of Unitarians, 290; Independents (or Congregationalists), their activity for disestablishment, *ib.*, the Liberation Society, *ib.*, autonomy of congregations, 291, training for the ministry, 291—293, ceremony of ordination, 293, relation of the pastor to his flock, 294, the Congregational Union, *ib.*; the Baptists, 289, autonomy of their congregations, 291; the Presbyterians, 289; the Wesleyans (or Methodists)—constitution and powers of the Conference, 296—298, the itinerant system, 298, training for the ministry and preliminaries of candidature, 298—301.

Norfolk, Duke of, and his kinsmen: an instance of precedence, ii. 33.

Northumberland, Duke of: organisation of his estates (Alnwick Castle), i. 51, 52; excavations, etc., at Tynemouth, 52, 53, ducal interests represented on the commission, 52; vast properties of the duke, 54—56; the farms upon his estate, 55, 56; duties of the chief commissioner, 56, bailiwicks and agents, 57.

Northumberland peasant: women beneficially employed in field labour, i. 323 *et seq.*; value of milk diet to, 382 (*footnote*); intelligence of, 336.

Novels and novelists: novel readers, *lii.* 401; good and bad novels, 402; Mr. Trollope as a novelist, *ib.*; Mr. Edmund Yates, *ib.*; Mr. Charles Reade, Mr. Wilkie Collins, 403. Lady novelists: Mrs. Oliphant, Mrs. Lynn Linton, Mrs. Cashel Hoey, 404; "Ouida," 405; Miss Braddon, Miss Broughton, 406; George Eliot's novels, 405. George Macdonald's novels, 407; the idyllic novel—Mr. Black, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Blackmore, 408; modern demand for "realism," 437; gains of novelists, 471.

## O

Odd Fellows, Manchester Unity of, i. 378.

Official England: exterior aspect of Government offices, ii. 98; the Colonial Office, its administration described, 99—105, Registry Office, 100, Under-Secretaries, 101—103, individual work of the Colonial Minister, 103—105; the India Office, its administration, 105, 106, the Indian Council, 106; the Foreign Office, its administration, 106—109, secrecy, 106, its departments, 108, 109, privileges of the diplomatic department, 108; the Board of Trade and its duties, 110—111; the Treasury, 109; the Privy Council, 109—110, its duties, 111—113, a meeting described, 112, 113; the Premier and the Sovereign, 113; duties of the Premier to his colleagues, *ib.*, ministerial communications to the Sovereign



- described, 115; meeting of a Cabinet Council, *ib.*, procedure in legislation described, 115, 116; arduous duties of a minister of State, 116—126; the day's routine, 116—118; numerous troublesome applications to, 119—126; Secretary for War, *see* The Army.
- Oliphant, Mrs., as a novelist, ii. 404.
- Organisation: the feature of the present age, i. 9, 10; the key to the present system of education, 507; in religion, of what is it a sign? ii. 313, 314. (For Organisation of Government and Trade, &c., *see* under the different heads.)
- "Ouida" as a novelist, ii. 405.
- Out-door relief: what it consists of, i. 343; consideration of it, 350—365; its evils, 351; its fallacies exposed, 353; its effect on honest labour—instance, the sempstress, 355; Mr. Pretyman on dispauperisation, 356, 360; deserted wives and neglected parents—instances, 360—362; degrading effects of, 362; condemnation of it, 364; Mr. Stansfeld on the difficulties of its abolition, 365; the Elberfield experiment, *ib.*
- Over-crowding, i. 312—316; Dr. Fraser on it, and propagation of disease thereby, 315.
- Overseers of the poor, i. 95.
- Over-trading, i. 211.
- Oxford: new Oxford, i. 170; effect of railway communication, *ib.*; married fellows, *ib.*
- Painting: social status of the artist and reasons, ii. 43; pottery-painting by ladies, 364; modern painting, ii. 365—372; loss of the "grand style," 365—367; realism of modern artists, *ib.*; "action" in Turner's paintings and its absence to-day, 366; the morbid school, 367—372, Mr. Burne Jones, 368—370, Mr. Whistler, 371, its sources of inspiration, *ib.*, Tissot's "Autumn," 372; excellence of the water-colour school, 369; critics—Mr. Ruskin, Mr. Hamerton, Mr. Pater, 373.
- P
- Palgrave, Mr., "The House of Commons," ii. 131, 153, 157.
- Palmerston, Lady, and the salon, ii. 66, 67; her exceptional power, 66; remarkable instance of it, "the expelled minister," *ib.*; her careful management, *ib.*
- Parents and children, Effects of changed social life upon, ii. 14.
- Parish, The (*see also* The Village): influence of Church of England in, 14, 15; the parson's difficulties in, 19, 20; disestablishment of its officials (Mr. C. S. Read thereon), 73; gradual loss of individual power of the parish, 75.
- Parks, The London, necessity for tree protection, i. 133.
- Parliament. (*See* The House of Commons and The House of Lords.)
- Parliamentary representatives. (*See* Members of Parliament.)
- Parsloe, Mr. Joseph, "Our Railway System," i. 439.
- Parson, The, a proper title, ii. 281. (*See* The Rector.)
- Pater, Mr. W. H., as an art critic, ii. 374, 396; his style, 396.
- Pauperism: the workhouse, i. 342; out-door relief, 343; the casual ward, *ib.*; the career of the pauper, 346 *et seq.*, "the failures of civilisation," 345; causes, *ib.*, not always drunkenness, *ib.*, accidental pauperism, 348, professional pauperism, *ib.*; necessity of the Poor Law, 349; out-door relief, its evils, 351, 352, fallacies exposed, 353, bad effect on honest labour, 355, deserted wives and neglected

parents, 359—362, its defenders, 363, obstacles to its abolition, 365; number and cost of paupers, 352; Mr. Pretyman on "Dispauperisation," 356, 360; effect of rates on wages and land, 357—359; ill effect of reliance on "the rates," 358; audacity of the professional tramp—instance, 359; degrading effects of receiving parochial relief, 362, idem of the Scotch Poor Law, *ib.*; evil tendencies of the Poor Law, 363; the Elberfeld experiment, 365; foreign pauperism, Bureaux de Bienfaisance, *ib.*, its operations, 366; pauperism aggravated in rich communities, *ib.*

Peasant, The. (See The Agricultural Labourer.)

Peasant proprietors, doubtful result of their creation, i. 319; difference of their habits in France and England, *ib.*

Penny banks, their operations and popularity, i. 373.

People, The: their moderation in times of trouble, i. 279; disposition of the masses to accept political situation, ii. 69—71; moved by facts, not theories, 69; effects of agitation, 70; their demands, 71; enthusiasm for Royalty, 71—73; docility of the modern "fire-brand," 72; ovations to political leaders, 73—75, the scene in Palace Yard described, 74, 75; Lord Derby on relation of Crown and people, "employers and employed," 85; Mr. Bagehot on the relation of the Crown to the masses through the Ministry and Parliament, 91, 92; approximation of classes in Government, 93; possible results of county suffrage and strife between classes, 191, 192; nautical aptitude of the nation our chief security, 230.

Perpetual curate, The. (See The Rector.)

Philosophy: recent revival of psychology in England, ii. 317; supremacy of philosophy over metaphysics, 318; the Scotch philosophy of common sense and its supporters—Dugald Stewart, Reid, Hume, 318, 319, its influence in France, 320; Positivism, doctrines of Auguste Comte and their influence on English philosophy, 321, tribute to Comte of G. H. Lewes, 324; psychology attacked, 322; "humanity," its system, *ib.*; M. Littré, *ib.*; religious Positivism, Frederic Harrison, *ib.*; its greatest element, "evolution of thought," 323; John Stuart Mill as a philosopher, 324—331, his special training, 325, utilitarianism and its uses, 329—331; Dr. Maudsley on mental phenomena, 331—333, on evolution of crime, 332, 333; Herbert Spencer as a philosopher, 334—342, his high position, 335, theory of evolution, *ib.*, "first principles," 336, theory of "the first cause," 341, "principles of psychology," 338, his analysis of the passion of love, 341; Alexander Bain's contributions to philosophy and its method, 342—345; G. H. Lewes as a philosopher, "History of Philosophy," 345, his contempt for metaphysics, 346, excellence of his style and method, 347; Darwin's "origin of species," and wide influence of his theories, 348—350; the triumph of analysis in the present day, 350; the influence of German thought, introduced by Coleridge, fostered by Carlyle, 351—353, influence of Hegel, 354; the future of philosophy, 355, its prospects as the religion of the future, "who is to be Pope?" 391, Christianity and philosophy, 416; current remuneration for philosophic writing, 471.

Physician, The. (See The Medical Profession.)

Physiology: growing influence of Mr. Lister in, ii. 384; its invasion of literature, instanced in the works of George Eliot, 388, 389.

- Plutocracy, its gradual identification with aristocracy, ii. 23; the merchant princes of to-day and yesterday, 24.
- Poacher, The, i. 305.
- Poetry and poets: Browning as a poet, ii. 397, 398; Swinburne, 397; Tennyson, 398, 399; Mortimer Collins, 398; Alfred Austin, "The Human Tragedy," 399, 400; remuneration of the poet, 471.
- Police, The: stringent rule at Liverpool, i. 161; operations of the police, 421—427; objections to, 421; their undoubted efficacy, *ib.*; the detective, operations of the Department of Criminal Investigation described, 422—427, advantages possessed by the foreign detective, 422, improvement in our own since the Kurr-Benson disclosures, 425; duties and services of the policeman, "a tribunal of the first instance," ii. 194—196; a police court and its aspect, 196—198, typical cases, 197, 198, procedure in a case of "theft from the person," 196—198.
- Politics: influence of, in magisterial appointments, i. 89, especially in appointment of borough magistrate, and evils of the process, 121, 122; operation of, in municipal affairs, 123; influence of members of Parliament in local bodies, 124, 125, their policy towards industrial electors defined, 126; the course of, carefully watched by merchants, 236, 237; political bias of the artisan—"a big England, but primarily trade," 287, 288; working men in Parliament, 289; thrown open to the middle classes by the Reform Bill, ii. 36; influence of the great families in, ii. 49—52; effect of the levelling up of the middle classes, 53; preponderance of aristocratic influence in the present Ministry, 53, 54; statesmanship not acquired from scholarship, 54; social influences, 55; female interest in, *ib.*; political element in the country house, 57, 58; clubs and their influence, 58; unwise actions of political clubs, 61; Conservative and Liberal clubs contrasted—the Carlton, the Reform, 62—64; treatment of rank and file by Conservative leaders, 63, by Liberal leaders, *ib.* The salon: reasons for its declining influence, 64, 65, exceptional power of Lady Palmerston, 66, remarkable instance of it—"the expelled minister," *ib.*, its present scope, 68; political dinners, 67; process of parliamentary reform, 76; the Caucus—its aim, uses, and evils, 77—84; supremacy of democratic polity, 85; statesmanship—its changed nature, and its necessities, 89, 90; considered as a profession, the necessity for wealth, 464, 465; the value of an unpaid legislature, 465; democracy in the colonies and at home, 493.
- Polity and laws, prevalent ignorance of, i. 10, 11.
- Poor Law, The: overseers and guardians, i. 95; beneficial action of, 337; necessity of it, 349; ill result of the Scotch Poor Law, 362; evil tendencies of its operations, 363; its defenders—the *Spectator*, *ib.*; its counterpart in continental countries, 366.
- Poor rates, their incidence on wages and on land, i. 357—359; ill effect of reliance on "the rates," 357.
- Positivism: its effects and doctrine, ii. 315, 316; Miss Martineau upon it, 315; Mr. John Morley, *ib.*; difficulties not met, *ib.*; influence of the doctrines of Comte, 321; tribute to Comte from G. H. Lewes, 324; its attack on psychology, 322; its system—"humanity," *ib.*; its greatest element—"evolution of thought," 323; Positivism of M. Littré, 322; religious Positivists—Mr. Frederic Harrison, 323.

- Post Office savings-banks, Deficiencies of, i. 372.
- Posting, as it is, i. 456, 457.
- Pottery trade, The: need of legislation for, i. 255.
- Precedence in England, ii. 29—33; Dod on precedence, 29; rank of great officers of state, hereditary and otherwise, 31; instances of the difficulties of, in English society, 33, the Duke of Norfolk and his kinsfolk, *ib.*
- Prefect, The, and fagging at public schools, i. 500—502.
- Premier, The: the Premier and the Sovereign, ii. 113; his duty to his colleagues, *ib.*; Mr. Gladstone upon his duties, *ib.*; numerous and troublesome applications to, 123.
- Prerogatives of the Queen, their vast extent, ii. 94; and limited exercise, 95.
- Presbyterians, The. (*See* Nonconformity.)
- Present age, The: characteristics of life in the nineteenth century, i. 1—4, 7—10, its difficulties, *ib.*, issues presented thereby, 4, 5; is essentially transitional, i. 9, 10; and an epoch of organisation and economy of force, *ib.*
- Press, The: excellence of, in provincial towns, i. 162; the rural labourer and his newspaper, 309, 310; the journalist, his occupation and income, ii. 471, 472; the daily press—its influence, 472, Mr. Frederic Harrison thereon, 473, its features, 473, 474; comparison of the French and English newspaper, *ib.*; economy and staff of a large "daily," 475, 476; the special correspondent, 476; the weekly press, *ib.*; features and prospects of modern journalism, 476—478.
- Pretyman, Mr., on dispauperisation, i. 356, 360.
- Primogeniture: its value, ii. 25; probable exclusive and disastrous result of the substitution of the French law, *ib.*
- Prince Consort, The, debt of art to, ii. 360, of music, 376.
- Princes of crime, similarity of career of, i. 419; their careers traced, 418—420.
- Prisons and prisoners: contraction of Quarter Sessions power through transfer of, i. 92, result of the transfer not decided, 110; procedure in prosecution of a criminal, 427; beneficial effect of the Prison Act of 1877, 428, 429; treatment of the prisoners—of the ordinary prisoner, 430—432, of the convict, penal servitude, 432, 433; earnings of prisoners, 433; discharged prisoners, 434—436, beneficial operations of the Prisoners' Aid Society, 436.
- Privy Council, The: its office, ii. 109, 110; its duties, 111—113; a council, 112, 113; the Premier and the Sovereign, 113; its aspect and constitution as a court of appeal, 224, typical cases brought before it, 225.
- Professional England: status of the professions, actual and popular estimate, ii. 40—48; merchant and stock-broker compared, 40—42; status of the painter, actor, doctor, attorney, 42—44, of the author, barrister, *ib.*, exceptional rank of soldier, clergyman, author, barrister, 44—47, reasons thereof, 46, 47, state recognition of these pretensions, 47, 48; transitional state of the professions and effacement of old lines of demarcation, 450; efficiency, a present essential, 451; insufficiency of openings in, 453; the civil engineer—attractions of, and predilection for the career, 451, 452; the chemist, 452; decreasing attractions of commercial life, 459; the university degree—advantages of "honours," 454, its value at the Bar, *ib.*, little value of an ordinary degree—the graduate's career as a colonist,

- as a schoolmaster, 457, 458; the profession of teaching, 458; the medical career—its prospects, income, and perils, 460—463; politics as a profession, 464, 465; diplomacy as a profession, 465—467; the army as a profession, 467—470; literature as a profession—its gains and prospects, 470—472, journalism and its duties, 471, 472; the professional career in India, 478—481, the competition wallah, 479—481; professional incomes—the barrister, 456, the doctor, 461, the soldier, 469, 470, poets and authors, 471, the journalist, *ib.*
- Prosecution of a criminal, procedure in, i. 427.
- Prospects of England discussed, ii. 501—504; and especially in relation to the colonies and Great Britain, 501, 502.
- Prosperity, Commerce the first essential of national, i. 205.
- Provinces, The. (*See Towns.*)
- Psychology: recent revival of, in England, ii. 317; attacked by Positivism, 322; Herbert Spencer's "Principles of Psychology," 338, his analysis of the passion of love, 340; its invasion of literature, 387—389.
- Public-house, The: its relation to depressed trade, i. 218; the evils of the village beer-house, 306.
- Public Record Office, recent services to literature of Professor Stubbs in, ii. 412.
- Public Schools, The: operation of the Public Schools Act, i. 487; increase in, 488; progress made by, *ib.*; neglect of parents—stimulated preference of play to study, 498, 499; their interior economy, 499—502; the prefect and fagging, 500—502; product of the public school, 502, increased sense of responsibility of the modern school-boy, 503; the public schools in Parliament, 504; excellence a necessity of social influence in, ii. 39.
- Public Works Loan Commissioners, The, i. 111.
- Puddler, Independence of the, i. 228.
- Pullman car, The, i. 443.
- Pupil teachers, i. 484; need of secondary schools, 485, 494.
- Quarter Sessions, Court of (*see also Magistrate*), i. 86—87; a meeting described, 89, 90; ii. 199—202; its duties, i. 90, 92, 93; ii. 199—202; importance of its members in times gone by, i. 90, 91; decline in the present day, *ib.*
- Q
- Queen, The. (*See The Crown.*)
- Queen's Counsel, "silk" and "stuff," ii. 208, 209.

## R

- Railways: general excellence of their management, i. 437; travelling third class, "the street in motion," 438; railway mileage, 439; signals—the semaphore, night signals, 439; Mr. Parsloe, "Our Railway System," 439 (*footnote*); the "block system," its working explained, 440; expenditure and income, 441; accidents, *ib.*; great speed attained, 442—444; Pullman cars, 443; eccentricities of progress on a Highland railway, 444; want of punctuality and difficulties, *ib.*; state control and enactments, 445, 446; the Railway Commissioners and their functions, 447, 448; inconveniences of independent action, 449; advantages of State control, 450; unsatisfactory supply of refreshments, 451; railway communication and popular amusements, "the excursion train," ii. 418—422.

- Railway Commissioners, The, and their functions, i.** 447, 448.
- Rank, Professional:** popular and actual estimate of, ii. 40—42; the merchant and stock-broker, *ib.*; the painter, actor, doctor, attorney, 42, 43; the author, the barrister, *ib.*; exceptional rank of the barrister, soldier, author and clergyman, and reason for it, 44—47, state recognition of these pretensions, 47, 48.
- Ratepayers, their privileges in relation to guardians, i.** 74; comparative impotence of the London ratepayer, 127.
- Read, Mr. C. S., on the disestablishment of the parish official, i.** 73; on agricultural wages, 333.
- Reade, Mr. Charles, as a novelist, ii.** 403.
- Receiver of stolen goods, The, i.** 413; his comparative immunity, *ib.*
- Recruiting, its procedure and safeguards, ii.** 254, 255.
- Rector, The:** his position, influence, and multifarious occupations, i. 14—25; the rectory, 17; parochial difficulties, 19, 20; his relation to the Education Office, 21; the benefit society, 24, 25; his importance admitted by Dissenters, 26, 32, their objections to him and the system, 32—34; the absentee rector, 26—28; the learned rector, the scholastic rector, 29, 30; the fervid rector, 31; necessity of tolerance and common sense, 31; example of its use, 40, 41, negligent rectors, 31; his responsibility to maintain the influence of the clergy, 36; his relation to the Board of Guardians, 76; the title "parson," ii. 281; the rector and vicar discriminated, *ib.*; tithes and their commutation, 282; perpetual curates, 283; Queen Anne's Bounty, *ib.*
- Rectory, The:** its aspect described, i. 17.
- Redesdale, Earl of:** his unique position in the House of Lords, ii. 184.
- Redgrave, Mr., on the results of factory legislation, i.** 268—271.
- Reform:** the process of parliamentary reform, ii. 76.
- Reform Bill, The:** its effect on social life, first, in the extinction of the claims of mere men of fashion; secondly, in throwing open politics; thirdly, in stimulating the aristocracy, ii. 35—37.
- Reform Club, The:** its aspects, ii. 63; unwise political action of, 61.
- Reformatories, Beneficial results of, i.** 409, 411.
- Registry Office. (See The Colonial Office.)**
- Religion (see also Church of England, Nonconformity, the Church of Rome, and the Jews):** debt due by religion to Nonconformity, i. 40; influence of, on magisterial appointments, 89; secularism of the London artisan, 290; secular and religious education, 473, "the London compromise," *ib.*; the pending question of secular and religious education, 508; variety of sects, ii. 264; general characteristics, activity and toleration, 266, the former not necessarily devotion, 267; Dr. Ince on the vicissitudes of English theology, 270; the question of inspiration, 271; other questions of the day and issues involved, *ib.*; Positivism—effects and doctrines of, 315, 316, Miss Martineau and Mr. Morley on, *ib.*, difficulties unmet, *ib.*; Dean Stanley on progress of theology, 273, on religion and science, 274; theology and religion, *ib.*; science and religion, *ib.*, their contact not necessarily opposition, 389—392; organisation and tolerance, what do they portend? 313; philosophy as the religion of the future, 391, 392; Christianity and philosophy, 416.
- "Repairing lease, The:"** a representative case of the difficulties of the law, ii. 204—215.

- Republic, The:** Mr. Chamberlain on the perfection of the polity of the United States, ii. 79, 80; temporary despotism of the presidential system, 92; contrasted with monarchy, 97.
- Reserves, The,** ii. 261.
- Responsibility of the Government,** increased in present age, i. 6, 7.
- Re-valuation of farms on the Devonshire estate,** i. 65.
- Review, The,** has become the political platform of the individual, ii. 128.
- Ritualism and the ritualist.** (*See The Church of England.*)
- Rochdale Pioneers, The,** i. 377; their operations described, 380, 381; contrasted with a London store, 382, 383; advantages offered to the working classes, 383—385.
- Rome.** (*See The Church of Rome.*)
- Rotation of crops, effects of the custom,** i. 325.
- Royalty and the Royal Family.** (*See The Crown.*)
- Rural administration:** the small squire dying out, i. 72; disestablishment of parish officials, 73; Mr. C. S. Read thereon, *ib.*; election to the Board of Guardians, 74, claims of candidates, 74, 76, privileges of ratepayers, 74; power of the individual parish declining, 75; duties of the board, 76; influence of the rector, *ib.*, of the farmer, 76, 77, of the lord lieutenant, 77, 78, evils of absenteeism, 79; desirable reforms, 80; a scene in a board-room, 80—82, composition of the board, *ib.*, its labours described, 82—86; the Court of Quarter Sessions, 86, 87, a meeting described, 89, 90, declining importance of its members, 90—92; method of appointment of magistrates, 88, 89; objections to the unpaid magistracy, 96—99; the village reeve and port reeve, 93; evils of divided authority in rural administration, and advantages of concentration, 94, 95, Mr. R. S. Wright thereon, 95; overseers, guardians, highway boards, burial boards, magistrates, *ib.*; the Local Board, a connecting-link, 100.
- Rural dean, The, and his office,** ii. 287.
- Rural districts** (*see also The Village*): Church of England preferable in, i. 35; influence of Dissent in villages and towns, 38—40.
- Rural labourer, The.** (*See Agricultural Labourer.*)
- Ruskin, Mr.,** debt of art to, ii. 361, 362; "Modern Painters," *ib.*; as an art critic, 373.

## S

- Salon, The:** reasons for its declining power, ii. 64, 65; exceptional influence of Lady Palmerston, 66; remarkable instance of it, "the expelled minister," *ib.*; its present scope, 68.
- Sanitation:** an important duty of guardians, i. 83—85; overcrowding in rural cottages, 312—316; indifference of the working classes to, 313; defects of the Sanitary Act, 314; Dr. Fraser thereon, 314, 315.
- Scarborough,** i. 185.
- School Board, The:** relation to municipal government, i. 105; zeal of its members, 105, 106; the Education Act—its results, deficiencies, and abuse, 259—263, 469, operation of, 472—474; its influence on the condition of the rural labourer, 298; the visitor, 466; operation of the bye-laws, 467; system of enforcing compulsory attendance, 468, early objections to, 469, its newness to Englishmen, practical beneficial result of, *ib.*; the attendance committee, *ib.*; State and voluntary aids under the old system, 470; Lord Brougham's advocacy of

- national education, 471; progress of State aid and control, 472; operations of the School Boards, 473; secular and religious teaching, the "London compromise," *ib.*; aim of the Education Department, 474; conditions of State grants, 475; remuneration of schoolmasters, *ib.*; a visit to a Board School, 475, 476, the official inspection, 476, generally unsatisfactory result of the teaching—learning by rote, 477, 478, anxiety to secure parliamentary grants, 480; statistics to show decrease of crime, 480—482; figures showing attendance, 483; vast expenditure and its rapid increase, 484; pupil teachers, necessity for secondary schools, 484, 485.
- Schoolmasters: the pay of School Board officials, i. 475; conferences of head masters, 493; the College of Preceptors, *ib.*; types of inefficient masters, 495, 496; the refuge of the ordinary graduate, ii. 457; teaching as a profession, ii. 458.
- Schools (*see also* The School Board, and Public Schools): the village school and its advantages, i. 294; necessity for secondary schools, 485, 494; grammar schools, 485, advantages offered by them in certain towns, *ib.*; the Endowed Schools Act, 486; schools of design, ii. 375; attitude of the universities, 492; direct and indirect inspection, efficiency of the latter, 497.
- Science: science and religion, ii. 274, their contact not necessarily opposition, 389—392; Huxley's method and services, 380—383, on the "protoplasm," 382; services and procedure of Professor Tyndall, 384; recent and growing influence of Mr. Lister on physiology, *ib.*; results of the *Challenger* Expedition, 385; Mr. St. George Mivart's opposition to Huxley and Tyndall, 387; invasion of science into literature, instanced in George Eliot's works, 387—389.
- Scope of this work, i. 10, 11.
- Seaside resorts, i. 181; attractions necessary, 182, 183; the seaside builder, 182; patronised by the middle classes, 184; aspects common to all of them, 185; Scarborough, *ib.*
- Secondary schools, The need of more, i. 485, 494.
- Secretaries of State. (*See* Official England.)
- Sects: the great variety of religious sects, ii. 264, 265.
- Secularism: of the London artisan, i. 289; secular education, i. 473, the London compromise, *ib.*; the pending question of secular and religious education, 508.
- Services, The. (*See* The Army and The Navy.)
- Shairp, Professor, as a critic, ii. 396.
- Sheffield. (*See* Yorkshire.)
- Shops, Legislative interference in, i. 259; the Saturday half-holiday, *ib.*; difficulties of, and need of discretion, 259.
- Short service in the army, its introduction and deficiencies, ii. 251—253.
- Signals on railways, use of semaphores and night signals, i. 439.
- Smith, Mr. George, on reforms in brick-yards, i. 257.
- Social life (*see also* Society): loss of insularity of English character, ii. 1, the effects of travel, 2, of intercourse with France, 3; the imprint of French habits, *ib.*, living in "flats" at Victoria Street, &c., its advantages, 4, 5, extreme adoption of French habits, 6, 7, effects of, on the stage, 7, on marriage and the relations of the sexes, 8, 14—17; decline of patriotic enthusiasm, 9; "change," the habit of the aristocracy, 9, 10; the squire of the old school and of the new, their homes and life, 10—13; the modern country house, 13; the



- season in London, *ib.*; effects on domesticity, fashionable parents and their children, 14, 15; effects on feminine independence, 17; the daily life of the modern young lady described, 18—20, effects of this novel liberty and possible ultimate beneficial result, 21; society in a country house, its constituents, 57; disappearance of "the wit," 58; club life, 59—61; social life in the colonies, 497, 498; colonial respect for the law, 498; supremacy of physical power in the colonies, 497.
- Society** (*see also* Social Life): its elements, aristocratic, plutocratic, democratic, *ii.* 22; gradual identification of the aristocratic and plutocratic elements, *ib.*, the merchant prince of to-day and yesterday, 24, the aristocracy and commerce, *ib.*; promogeniture, its value, and probable disastrous results of substitution of French law, 25; English nobility not "noblesse," 26; meeting of divers ranks in society, 28, 29, reserve arising therefrom, 28; precedence, 29—33; social advantages possessed by commoners, 34, exceptional positions achieved by some, 34; effect of the Reform Bill (1) in extinction of claims of pure men of fashion, (2) in throwing open politics, (3) in vitalising the aristocracy, 35, 36; "action" a necessity to distinction, 37; earnestness of an Englishman's pursuits, 38; excellence a necessity of success throughout life, 39. Professional rank: the actual and popular estimate of it, 40—48, the merchant and stock-broker compared, 40—42, of the artist, and reasons, 43, of the actor, painter, doctor, attorney, 42, 43, of the author, barrister, *ib.*, reasons for exceptional position of the author, barrister, soldier, or clergyman, 44—47, State recognition of these pretensions, 47, 48; its influence in politics, 55; a seat in Parliament does not confer absolute social rank, 130; titles to social consideration in the colonies, 497.
- Sovereign, The.** (*See* The Crown.)
- Speaker, The:** his duties and privileges, *ii.* 156, 162; the Speaker of the House of Lords, 177.
- Special correspondent, The,** *ii.* 476.
- Spencer, Herbert:** philosophy of, *ii.* 334—342, extreme importance of, 334; extraordinary grasp of a subject, 335; "System of Philosophy," *ib.*; his theory of evolution, *ib.*; "First Principles," 336; his theory of "the First Cause," 341; "Principles of Psychology," 338; his analysis of the passion of love, 340.
- Squatter, The village,** *i.* 305.
- Squire, The:** his position and occupation, *i.* 14; absenteeism, 15; the small squire dying out, 72, 327; a squire of the old school and of the new contrasted, their homes and life, *ii.* 11—13.
- Stage, The:** excellence of, in provincial towns, *i.* 162; effects of intercourse with the French, *ii.* 7; social status of the actor, its recent improvement, 43, 433; the theatre and its supporters, "old" and "new," 431—433; does not aim at moral instruction, 433; influence of the French school, *ib.*, and of the music-hall, 434; public demand for realism and necessity of restraint in its lower aspects, 437, 438; the "Ober-Ammergau" play, *ib.*; French morality not suitable to our stage, and reasons, 438—441; the Lord Chamberlain as Licensor of Plays, his functions and defence of his office, 441—448; French plays in London, 448; improbability of a Shakesperian revival, 449.

- Stage-coach, The: the old and the new, i. 453—456; amateur coaches, 456; "White Horse Cellars," *ib.*
- Stanley, Dean: on the progress of theology, ii. 273; on science and religion, 274; his theological writings, 410.
- Stansfeld, Mr., on out-door relief, i. 365.
- State, The (*see also* The Crown, and Official England): increased responsibilities of, i. 6, 7; contact of imperial and local governments, i. 109; relation to friendly societies, 370, 371; its relation to railways, 445, 446; advantages of State control of railways, 450; its relation to education—limited aid and interference under the old system, 470, progress of its aid and control, 472, conditions of State grants, 475, how educational grants may become denominational endowments, 508; State recognition of exceptional social rank in certain professions, ii. 47, 48; probable result of county suffrage, 191, possible strife between classes, 192; secure tenure of the constitution, *ib.*; possible national calamities, 193; the State and art, 375; financial relations with the colonies, 485, its relation to the colonies, 488—499, Burke upon this relationship, 499.
- State emoluments, The artisan's view of, i. 245.
- Statesmanship: how acquired, ii. 54; not through scholarship, 55; its changed nature in modern times, and necessities, 89; candour indispensable, 90.
- Statute fair, The: its evils, i. 322; happily dying out, *ib.*
- Stewart, Dugald, and the Scotch philosophy of common sense, ii. 318.
- Stock-broker, The: social status of, ii. 40—42; contrasted with that of the merchant, *ib.*
- Stock Exchange, The: its operations, i. 196; its aspect described, 197; investment business, 198; gambling or speculative business, 198, 199; issue of a foreign loan, 200—203, deception practised on the public, 202, 203.
- Structure of English society, The, ii. 22.
- Stubbs, Professor, at the Record Office, his services to literature, ii. 412.
- Surgeon, The. (*See* The Medical Profession.)
- Swinburne, Mr., as a poet, ii. 397.
- Symonds, Mr. J. A., as a critic, ii. 396.

## T

- Table d'hôte, The, i. 460—463; unsuitability to the ordinary Englishman, *ib.*
- Temperate regions of the earth, their extent and occupation by England, ii. 484.
- Tennyson as a poet, ii. 398, 399.
- Textile trade, The, i. 207.
- Thames Embankments, The, i. 132.
- Theatres. (*See* The Stage.)
- Theft, Legal procedure in a case of, illustrated, ii. 196—198.
- Theological literature: writings of John Henry Newman, ii. 410; of Dean Stanley, *ib.*
- Theology. (*See* Religion.)
- Thrift: regularity of wages in Lancashire contributory to; excess in mining districts accounts for absence of, i. 142; friendly societies, 366, 377, necessity of co-operation of employers, instances and difficulties, 368; benefits accruing to members of friendly societies,

- 871, 872, suggestions for State control, 872; Post Office savings-banks, *ib.*, their deficiencies, *ib.*; Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows, 878; penny banks—their operations and popularity, 874; the real incitements to thrift, *ib.*; advantages of co-operation, 875; Mr. George Howell on earnings of the working man, *ib.* (*footnote*); statistics of friendly societies, 876 (*footnote*).
- Tithes and their commutation, ii. 282.
- Toleration: a necessity in religious teaching, i. 31; a feature of the religion of the day, ii. 266; in this respect, what does it portend? 313, 314.
- Town, The: Dissent in towns and in rural districts, i. 38—40; imperceptible growth of the village into town, 101; country town and village compared, 101, 102; characteristics of the former, 102, 103; provincial and London artisan contrasted, 289—292. (*See Towns of Business and Towns of Pleasure.*)
- Town Council, The: constitution and duties of, i. 106, 107; the municipal offices, 108; the committees, 109; the aldermen, *ib.*; a meeting described, 113, its procedure, *ib.*, its oratory, 114, 115; its training, good and bad, 116, 117; functions, position, and unceasing duties of the Mayor, 117—119; idem of the Lord Mayor of London, 118, 119; provincial aldermen not magistrates, 119.
- Town labourer, The. (*See The Artisan.*)
- Towns of business: the industrial town embodies science and industry, i. 134, cheerless aspect of, 135, sudden change from rural to industrial districts, *ib.*; fusion of the elements of life, a source of national power, *ib.*; money-getting not the sole impulse, 136, other beneficial aims, *ib.*; Lancashire sixty years since, and to-day, 136, 137; Manchester and Liverpool, capitals of commerce, yet centres of culture, 137; cultivation of the fine arts, 138; the plutocrat not the reigning type, *ib.*; the Yorkshire manufacturer's household, 139, 140; tendency towards increased luxury, Bradford and Sheffield houses, 141; love of sport in Yorkshire, 141, 142; pay of the Lancashire factory hand and Yorkshire miner—regularity of the one, excess and consequent absence of thrift with the other, 142; the toiling population, hardly visible in London, predominant in Leeds and Manchester, 143, 144; Liverpool and Manchester contrasted, 145—148, 157—160; smaller manufacturing towns and villages, 147, 148; Liverpool, its population and society, 152—158.
- Towns of pleasure: aspect of a cathedral city, i. 169; changed Oxford, 170, effect of railway communication, *ib.*, married fellows, 171; the cathedral close, its denizens, its social life, "Mrs. Proudie," 171, 172; Bristol, 173; Durham, *ib.*; Exeter and its attractions, 173, 174; Canterbury, 174; York, *ib.*; Cheltenham, 175, 176; Leamington, *ib.*; Bath and its beauty, *ib.*; Clifton, *ib.*; necessities of prosperity—medical repute, a school or college, churches, 177, 178; jealousies of inhabitants, 178; recreations—croquet, lawn tennis, 179, increased intercourse of the young through these pastimes, 180; sea-side resorts, 181, features common to all, 185, attractions essential, 182, 183, the sea-side builder, 182, essentially patronised by the middle classes, 184, 185, Scarborough, 185; Buxton and its special advantages, 186.

Trade. (*See* Commercial England and Financial England.)

Trades councils, i. 124; the influence on them of the member of Parliament, 124, 125; the council dinner, 125.

Trades unions: their influence not baneful, i. 282—285; results of arbitration, 284—287; the masons' strike of 1877, 286; objection to foreigners, 287.

Tramp, Audacity of the, an instance, i. 359.

Transition: the present an age of transition, i. 9, 10; transitional state of the law, ii. 226, 227, of the professions, 450.

Transportation, Evils of the system of, i. 408.

Travel and biography, ii. 409.

Travelling: cheapness of, in present days, i. 437; general excellence of railway management, *ib.*; "travelling third-class," 438, "the street in motion," *ib.*; the railway system, 439—452; great speed attained, 442—444; Pullman cars, 443; a Highland railway, 444; railway refreshments, 451; London vehicles, 452; the stage-coach, old and new, 453—456, the amateur coach, 456, "the White Horse Cellars," *ib.*; posting as it is, *ib.*; the bicycle and its advantages, 458; the modern hotel, 458—463; the table d'hôte, 460—463; effects of travel on our social life, ii. 2; influence of railways on popular amusements, 419, 420.

Treasury, The: its position, ii. 109; numerous troublesome applications to the First Lord and Chancellor of the Exchequer, 123.

Treaty Department, The. (*See* The Foreign Office.)

Trees in London: need of protection, i. 133.

Trollope, Mr. Anthony, as a novelist, ii. 402.

Truck system, The, i. 263—265; not absolutely extinguished, *ib.*

Tyndall, Professor: his procedure in science, ii. 384; his services, *ib.*; opposition of Mr. St. George Mivart, 386.

Tynemouth, Excavations at, i. 52; the Duke of Northumberland's properties at, *ib.*, the ducal interests represented on the commission, 53.

## U

Under Secretaries of State. (*See* Official England.)

Unions. (*See* Agricultural Unions, Trades Unions.)

Unitarians. (*See* Nonconformity.)

United States, The: the artisan in his relation to the State contrasted with the English, i. 247; Mr. Chamberlain on the perfection of her polity, ii. 79; the Caucus in, *ib.*

Unity of Odd Fellows, The Manchester, i. 373.

Universities, The: inducements held out to graduates by the State, i. 489; liberal policy of—middle-class examinations, 491, 492, unattached students, 491, new professorial chairs, 492; their relation to schools, *ib.*; the university degree—professional value of "honours," ii. 454, its effect at the Bar, *ib.*, the ordinary graduate's career, 457, small value of his degree, *ib.*, his prospects in the colonies, 458, as a schoolmaster, *ib.*

Utilitarianism, and its application, ii. 329, 331.

## V

Vehicles, London, i. 452, 453.

Vestries, The London, i. 128; their operations described, 129.

Vicar, The. (*See* The Rector.)

**Village, The:** a microcosm, i. 13, 14; position of the squire, 14; position and duties of the rector, 14—25; influence of the Church of England, 14, 15, 39, 40; absenteeism, 15; an ideal village, 16, 17; the rectory, 17; parochial difficulties, 19, 20; auspicious nature of the peasant, 22, 23; the benefit society, 24, 25; agricultural unions: objections to the system, 34; different types of farmers, 36—38, a modern farmer's family, 38; Dissent in rural districts, 39, 40; imperceptible growth into a town, 101; a country village and country town contrasted, 101, 102; modern improved aspect of, 294; advantages offered by the village school, 294, 295; the modern cottage, 295; the co-operative store, 307—309; sanitary defects of, 313, 314, the close and open village, 315 (*footnote*).

**Violence, Crimes of,** i. 417, 418.

**Voluntary aid to education,** i. 470.

**Volunteers, The:** their origin, ii. 260; zeal, 261; and importance, 262.

## W

**Wages:** agricultural wages, i. 331—334; Mr. Little thereon, 332, 333; Mr. C. S. Read, 333; special instance of wages paid on one day throughout England, 333, 334; cheapness of necessities, 335; Mr. G. Howell on wages and expenses, 375 (*footnote*).

**Wallah, The competition,** ii. 479—481.

**Walpole, Mr. Spencer, as an historian,** ii. 411.

**War Office and Secretary for War.** (*See The Army.*)

**Watering-places.** (*See Sea-side Resorts.*)

**Wesleyans, The (or Methodists).** (*See Nonconformity.*)

**Westminster authorities, The,** i. 128.

**Westminster, Duke of, organisation of his estates at Eaton Hall,** i. 50; security of tenure of employment upon them, *ib.*

**Whip, The parliamentary, and his functions,** ii. 147—149.

**Whistler, Mr., as an artist,** ii. 371.

**White-lead works, Need of legislation for,** i. 266.

**Woburn Abbey, Feudal customs at,** i. 49.

**Women:** State protection of, i. 248; as field labourers, 323—325, Dr. Fraser's objections to, 323, satisfactory employment of, in North-umberland, 323—325; higher teaching of girls, 505, its doubtful result, 507; independence resulting from changed social life, ii. 17, present effect of it and possible beneficial result, 21; life of a modern young lady described—Rotten Row, five o'clock tea, 18—20; influence in politics, 56, 66; æstheticism in dress and recreations, 364, 365; lady novelists, 404—406.

**Workhouse, The:** its appearance and inmates, i. 342; out-door relief and casual wards, 343; scrutiny of applicants, *ib.*; one treatment for all, 344; children born in "the house," 345. (*See Out-door Relief.*)

**Working classes, The** (*see also The Artisan, The Agricultural Labourer, The Factory Operative, and The Mining Population*): enormous power of, i. 239, 240; diversity of, a guarantee of order, 241, 242; benefits of free discussion, 241; advanced propaganda—the Eleusis Club, 242; State protection of women and children, 248; excessive legislation a blunder, 249; course and effects of legislation up to this point, 250—259, reforms not fully realised, 254, reforms yet necessary, 255—259, 264—266; abuses extant in the Black Country, 271, 272; employer and employed, moderation of the latter, 279,

- instance, the cotton famine, *ib.*, contrast with past times, the Nottingham frame-breakers, 280, 281, rare instances of violence in this age, 282; trades unions, 282—287, their influence not baneful, 282—285, beneficial results of arbitration, 284, 285; political bias of, 287, 288; working men in Parliament, 289; the London and provincial artisan compared, 289—292; overcrowding, and indifference to sanitation, 312—316; Mr. George Howell on wages and cost of living, 375 (*footnote*); advantages accruing to them from the co-operative movement, 383—385, 398; ignorance of the economy of life, 479; their amusements in the northern counties, *ii.* 423, in London—the music-hall, the museum, the free library, 424—426; the working man's club, its constitution, aims, aspect, and prospects, 426—430.
- Wright, Mr. R. S., on the concentration of rural administration, *i.* 95.

## Y

- Yates, Mr. Edmund, as a novelist, *ii.* 402.
- Yeoman, Disappearance of the, *i.* 327.
- York, The city of, *i.* 174.
- Yorkshire: frugality of the Yorkshire manufacturer, *i.* 139, 140; excellence of his household, 140; tendency to luxury in towns—Sheffield, Bradford, 141; Yorkshire love of the horse—the St. Leger, *ib.*; sport in Sheffield, 142, evils of betting, *ib.*; the mining population a fine race, 143, excess and irregularity of their earnings and consequent absence of thrift, 142; the future of Leeds, 165.

THE END.



